

immediate prohibition as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of the Young People's Society of the New First Congregational Church of Chicago for war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED: Evidence to accompany House bill 12274, to increase the pension of John S. Brannon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE: Petitions of residents of Pen Argyl and of Bethlehem, both in the State of Pennsylvania, for the amendment of the Constitution to prevent polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE.

MONDAY, May 27, 1918.

Rev. J. L. Kibler, of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

In the plenitude of Thy mercy, O Lord, look upon us as we come humbly into Thy presence. Surely we need Thee as never before. More and more do we realize the tremendous responsibility which rests upon us in the world conflict; and we tremble lest our sins rise up against us and be a reproach to our people. O Thou King of Kings, Thou God of mercy, blot out our transgressions, and incline Thine ear to our supplications. Help us to cling to Thy hand and to claim Thy power. Keep our motives pure, and strengthen our hands for the mighty struggle. Help us to seek that wisdom which is from above, and that righteousness which exalteth a nation; and may Thy kingdom come and over all nations prevail. We ask it for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Hardwick	Nugent	Smith, Ariz.
Borah	Hitchcock	Overman	Smith, Ga.
Calder	Johnson, Cal.	Page	Smith, Md.
Chamberlain	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose	Smith, Mich.
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Phelan	Smoot
Culberson	Kendrick	Pittman	Sutherland
Cummins	Kenyon	Polindexter	Thomas
Curtis	King	Pomerene	Thompson
Fall	Kirby	Ransdell	Townsend
Fletcher	Lewis	Reed	Trammell
France	McCumber	Saulsbury	Vardaman
Frelinghuysen	McLean	Shafroth	Wadsworth
Gallinger	McNary	Sheppard	Walsh
Gerry	Martin	Sherman	Warren
Guion	Myers	Shields	Wilkey
Harding	Norris	Simmons	

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Goff], is absent on account of illness.

Mr. SHIELDS. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. McKellar] is detained on official business. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. GERRY. I wish to announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Williams] is detained by illness in his family. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. KIRBY. I desire to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Robinson] is detained on official business. I wish also to announce that the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. James] is detained by illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2812) to encourage and promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, and sodium on the public domain, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (45) providing that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, the 27th day of May, 1918, at 1 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution (45) from the House of Representatives, which was read.

### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

May 27, 1918.

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assembled in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, the 27th day of May, 1918, at 1 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.*

Mr. MARTIN. I move that the Senate concur in the resolution just laid before the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have a petition from the Woman's Civic Club of Seattle asking for the passage of the Susan B. Anthony amendment submitting the question of suffrage to the various States without delay. I ask that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SEATTLE, WASH., May 17, 1918.

Hon. WESLEY L. JONES,  
United States Senate.

Whereas the women of our country are cordially responding to every call of our Government in its endeavor to conserve materials and have not hesitated to add to their duties so as to release all available man power for the Army and Navy; and Whereas President Wilson believes that to grant woman suffrage at this time is a simple matter of justice to patriotic womanhood: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Woman's Civic Club of Seattle, Wash., in regular session assembled, That we urgently pray the United States Senate to pass the Susan B. Anthony amendment submitting the question of suffrage to the various States without delay, thereby assuring all women that democracy is as surely for them as for their brothers, thus enabling suffragists to give their undivided attention to war work; and be it*

*Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Wilson, to Vice President Marshall, and to Senators MARTIN, GALLINGER, BORAH, JONES of Washington, and POINDEXTER.*

Representing 100,000 women voters.

Mrs. CORNELIUS G. RUNTE,  
Corresponding Secretary.

Mr. JONES of Washington presented a petition of McKinley Grange, No. 596, Patrons of Husbandry, of Toppenish, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the leasing of Indian reservation lands only to persons, citizens, or intending citizens of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of the President of the Spokane & Eastern Trust Co., of Spokane, Wash., and a memorial of the Tacoma Savings Bank & Trust Co., of Tacoma, Wash., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation granting to national banks such authority and power that the several States have not granted, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a telegram in the form of a petition from the local branch, Ohio Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Columbus, Ohio, praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. McLEAN. I have received a large number of telegrams containing resolutions favoring the adoption of the Susan B. Anthony amendment. They are so numerous that I do not feel like asking to have them printed in the Record, for I believe that is as unwise as it is unnecessary, but I ask unanimous consent that one of them be printed in the Record, as it is a fair sample of the very large number which I have received.

There being no objection, one of the telegrams was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NEW HAVEN, CONN., May 27, 1918.

G. P. McLEAN,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Whereas there is tremendous increase in the favorable sentiment toward woman suffrage in this country and widespread recognition of equal suffrage as a war measure; and Whereas the delay and opposition of the Federal suffrage amendment by undemocratic Members in the Senate is creating a country-wide condemnation: Therefore be it

*Resolved, That we, the political workers of the third congressional district of Connecticut, in a meeting called for this purpose, do hereby protest at the deferred action and do earnestly request the Senate to pass the Susan B. Anthony amendment at the earliest possible date, and we also request that this resolution be written into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.*

HANNAH D. TOWNSEND, Chairman.  
GLADYS BRAGDON, Secretary.

Mr. McLEAN presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Connecticut, praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the State Medical Society of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide advanced rank for officers of the Medical Corps of the Army, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. NELSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Minnesota, praying for the submission of a Federal

suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Minnesota, praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. COLT presented a petition of the Society of the Mayflower Descendants of the State of Rhode Island, praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Bankers' Association of the State of Rhode Island, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to guarantee bank deposits under \$5,000, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. HARDING. I present a communication from the Farmers' Telephone Co., of Sidney, Ohio, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FARMERS' TELEPHONE CO.,  
Sidney, Ohio, May 21, 1918.

Hon. WARREN G. HARDING,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our company, operating in Shelby County, has in operation over 1,300 telephones serving the men who are producing the food to win the war and who are buying the liberty bonds, war-savings stamps, etc., to finance it, and who are sending their sons to the defense of their country, is being discriminated against by the Bell Telephone Co. and its allied interests as common carriers by being denied the privilege of long-distance telephone connection.

We as a people believe in democracy and pledge our all to its cause; we declare for equal rights to all and special privilege to none. We have sought relief through the legislature and was denied our rights through political connivance by the manipulations of special interests. We therefore respectfully request your earnest cooperation in behalf of relief of this and similar situation. We further request that this communication be read into the records and placed in the hands of the proper committee.

Very truly, yours,

C. C. HERMETET,

Secretary and General Manager.

Approved:

THE SHELBY COUNTY FARM BUREAU ASSOCIATION,  
LOUIS E. MAHRS, President.  
N. J. MOORE, Secretary.

#### SALARIES OF CLERKS OF DISTRICT COURTS.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 3079) fixing the salary of the clerks of the United States district courts; prescribing how and when they shall account for the fees collected; providing for the office expenses of such clerks, including salaries of deputy clerks and clerical assistants; and for the travel and subsistence expense of such clerks and their deputies when necessarily absent from their official residences, reported it with an amendment.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 4611) to provide an ice-breaking vessel for use in New York Harbor; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 4612) for the relief of Morris Dietrich; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4613) for the relief of Charles Raudenbush (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4614) granting an increase of pension to Henry Gottman (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4615) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Niles (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4616) granting an increase of pension to Henry Care (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4617) granting a pension to Cora J. Swavely;

A bill (S. 4618) granting an increase of pension to Washington B. Coder;

A bill (S. 4619) granting an increase of pension to Henry L. Reinhold;

A bill (S. 4620) granting an increase of pension to Henry Korn; and

A bill (S. 4621) granting an increase of pension to William C. Robbins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 4622) to amend section 501 of an act approved March 8, 1918, entitled "An act to extend protection to the civil rights of members of the Military and Naval Establishments of the United States engaged in the present war;" to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 4623) to amend section 15 of an act entitled "An act to establish a Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization and to provide for a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States," approved June 29, 1906, as amended; to the Committee on Immigration.

A bill (S. 4624) to prohibit the teaching of the German language in the public schools of any Territory of the United States or in the public schools of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 4625) to make it unlawful and to punish giving commissions, bribes, or rewards to employees and to accept the same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NUGENT:

A bill (S. 4626) providing for a survey of certain unsurveyed lands within the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

#### MINING ON THE PUBLIC DOMAIN.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2812) to encourage and promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, and sodium on the public domain.

Mr. PITTMAN. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. PHELAN, Mr. SHAFROTH, Mr. SMOOT, and Mr. FALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### DISTRICT RENT ADMINISTRATOR—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I submitted a few days ago the conference report on Senate joint resolution 152, and I move that it be taken up.

Mr. SMOOT. Let it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 152) to prevent rent profiteering in the District of Columbia having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 28, and agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language proposed by the House insert the following: "a treaty of peace shall have been definitely concluded between the United States and the Imperial German Government, or until provided by Congress," and in line 3 of the engrossed bill, after the word "until," strike out "the"; and the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 1, line 6, of the engrossed bill, after "agreement," strike out the words "or written"; and the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 2, line 16, of the engrossed bill, after the word "agreement" strike out "or written"; and the House agree to the same.

WILLARD SAULSBURY,

ATLEE POMERENE,

LAWRENCE Y. SHERMAN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

BEN JOHNSON,

ROBERT CROSSER,

WILLIAM J. CARY,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I move the immediate consideration of the conference report.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I did not hear the request of the Senator from Delaware.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware moved the consideration of the conference report. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. SMOOT. That can not be done without unanimous consent. It is not yet 1 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The rule is that when presented the question shall be immediately put and that it shall be decided without debate.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Rule XXVII provides for just this condition. I fancy that the conference report can be agreed to



in a few minutes. It is, of course, in order under the rule. The rule is very strict that the question of consideration shall be settled without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Delaware to proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I think there are some Senators concerned about this matter who are not present. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Possibly the Senator from Florida was not in the Chamber when the roll was called. I raise the question as to whether the call for a quorum is in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Business has been transacted since the former call.

Mr. FLETCHER. I withdraw the call for a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Delaware to proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words in regard to the report. Apparently about the only change submitted by the conferees is adding the words "unless in the meantime otherwise provided by Congress," and limiting the time to the close of the war instead of one year thereafter. The language would be "that until the close of the present war between the United States and the Imperial German Government, unless in the meantime otherwise provided by Congress," no recovery of possession of premises can be had. It is limited to the period of the war "unless in the meantime otherwise provided by Congress." Of course, that language really does not mean anything, because Congress can at any time change any law it may have previously passed. If the joint resolution was passed without that provision in it, it would not be binding except so long as Congress might not change it. This clause, it seems to me, is without any real effect or meaning.

The situation is simply this, and I feel this way about it, putting myself in the position of a landlord in the District of Columbia for the moment, and it seems to me fair for us in considering a matter of this sort to apply the case to ourselves as to both sides, as to the landlord and as to the tenant. Putting myself, as I said, in the position of a landlord for the moment, a landlord who wants to do his whole duty by the Government, who is patriotic, I would say, if I were a landlord and the Government wanted my property, if the Government needed my property, I stand absolutely ready on the minute to deed it to the Government. I would not have the slightest hesitation about it. If I was satisfied the Government required my property for the purposes of the war, the Government could take it without a moment's delay, with my prompt, free, and full consent, and I believe this is the sentiment, practically unanimous, of the property owners of this District.

On the other hand, if the Government desires to take possession of my property for the benefit of some people who would like to enjoy it and deprive me of its possession and its control not for the benefit of the Government, but for the benefit of some people who may be occupying it for the present, who are in no wise connected with any activity of the Government, I say that is simply inexcusable tyranny; it is rank and wanton despotism; it is oppression of the meanest kind, in my judgment.

There are a number of people in the city of Washington who are here because Washington is the center of things, not because they are doing any work for the Government, not because they are serving the country. They are here to enjoy the society of Washington, to enjoy the privileges of Washington for their own benefit, not because they are needed here, not because they are wanted here, not because they are doing any work here for the Government. People of that class, to whom a landlord in this District may have rented an apartment last October, for instance, or a residence, will be in a position under this joint resolution to say that they propose to continue to occupy that apartment or that residence until the war is ended, no matter how long that may be. Congress proposes to put it in the power of those tenants in that relation to the Government, who are not only not serving the Government themselves, but are occupying premises that ought to be occupied by war workers, and the landlord is made powerless to get rid of them or to make available those premises for the use of those who are at work for the Government. There are people here who ought not to be here, have no business here, occupying premises, and you undertake to say these people may continue to occupy those premises indefinitely, no matter what contract they may have solemnly made with the lessor as to the termination of such lease.

Instead of the joint resolution operating for the advantage and benefit of those who are here serving the Government, at work

in any of the departments, it will operate just the other way. It will deprive those people of the advantages which they might have were landlords in different cases permitted to carry out the terms of the solemn contract entered into with the tenant. A tenant, for instance, leased an apartment or a residence last October under a lease which provides that it shall expire on the 1st of the coming October. Congress proposes to say, notwithstanding that solemn contract entered into between the landlord and the tenant terminating that lease on the 1st of October, it shall remain in force and effect until the end of the war. It is a monstrous proposition, helpful to nobody except the people who are actually occupying the premises; and, as my correspondence will show and my information from reliable sources supports, those people, in a great number of instances, are here simply because they like to be in Washington and are in nowise engaged in any work or any undertaking that is helpful to the Government; people, for instance, who have sons in the departments, they like to be near, for their own pleasure, who are here in disregard of the public interest. You propose to take property for their benefit, not for any public purpose. The Congress has no constitutional power to authorize the taking of property for other than public use, and then only upon just compensation.

Mr. President, take this sort of a case: The owner of a residence in this city of Washington on the 1st of last October, for instance, may have rented a portion of that residence to a tenant; that lease expires next October. The tenant may not have violated, and may not violate, any of the terms of that lease; he may pay the rent; he may not have committed any tort or, wrong that under the terms of the lease would make it possible for the landlord to dispossess him. If this resolution passes, the owner of that property would be utterly unable to resume possession of his own residence after the expiration of that lease by its express terms.

Suppose the landlord decides that he himself wants to use his own property and does not care to rent any portion of it beyond next October. He reaches that conclusion; it is his property; he desires to possess it. His tenant, who is occupying it, is not engaged in any war work; he is not concerned in any endeavor here by way of supporting the Government, but is simply enjoying the society of Washington. Under this joint resolution the owner of the property is unable to get possession of his own residence, or that portion of it which he may have rented, notwithstanding the contract, under seal, witnessed, and all that, solemnly made, that on the 1st of next October the tenant would cease to be an occupant of those premises. Congress proposes to say that the owner of the residence himself shall not be privileged to stand upon the terms of his contract with the tenant and to occupy his own property. I say, Mr. President, that I do not believe any court in the country will sustain such a law, or that it ought to be sustained.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Assuming that the lease was made last October and expires on the 1st of next October, and the premises are occupied by a tenant, could the landlord or his own family, having been temporarily out of possession, occupy it themselves instead of the tenant, or would they be compelled to let it go?

Mr. FLETCHER. That tenant could pay the rent and the landlord could not get possession of his own premises under this joint resolution. That is the situation in which this resolution leaves the community and leaves the owners of property.

I submit that it is not a war measure. It does not help in this situation from any standpoint whatsoever. The only person it would help would be the person who has a present lease on premises in the District of Columbia, and it is not mutual as to that person. There is nothing fair about it from that standpoint. If the joint resolution went on to provide that if the tenant desired to end the lease he should not be allowed to do so, but must go on and pay the rent; as it does provide, on the other hand, that the landlord can not insist on his rights under the lease, but must accept the rent from the tenant and allow the tenant to occupy his premises until the end of the war, there might be something somewhat mutual in that sort of an arrangement; but here the tenant is under no obligation to continue in the possession of the property; he simply has the right to do it, and the landlord is deprived of any sort of process by which he can acquire possession of his own property.

It was utterly impossible for a landlord in this community to have foreseen last October that this sort of a situation might arise, whereby the Government would step in and say: "Notwithstanding you only intended and contracted to lease your premises for a fixed term, that term we hereby extend for an

indefinite period." The landlord could not have foreseen that condition. Is it fair or just to impose it upon him in these circumstances, when the effect of the resolution, as I have said, in the great majority of cases is in no wise to help those who are doing work for the Government?

We have recently passed a law to provide for the erection of barracks and buildings for the accommodation of war workers in the District of Columbia; they will be taken care of under that law; provisions will be made for them in such a way that it will be impossible to impose upon them.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I again interrupt the Senator from Florida?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senator from Florida answered me a while ago, when I put the case to him of a landlord himself desiring to occupy the premises, after the termination of the lease. Does the Senator understand that, even where the landlord himself was connected with the Government—a Member of Congress, for instance, or any other individual connected with the Government, if that individual happens to be connected with the Government in any way—would he not be entitled to the possession of the premises at the end of the lease if he himself wanted to occupy them?

Mr. FLETCHER. It is possible in that situation under a provision of the joint resolution, that, if "the premises are necessarily required by a landlord or bona fide purchaser for occupation either by himself or his wife, children, or dependents while he is in the employ of or officially connected with any branch of the Government," he may get possession of the property if he can show that his premises are necessarily required by him for his own occupation, either by himself, wife, children, or dependents, or he himself is in the employ or officially connected with a branch of the Government. I believe under the joint resolution in such a case he would be entitled to institute proceedings and recover possession. Of course, there are landlords in the District of Columbia who are not in the employ of the Government, and who are not officially connected with any branch of the Government. A vast majority of the landlords no doubt occupy that position.

Mr. SAULSBURY. May I ask the Senator from Florida a question?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Does the Senator think it is such a horrible condition of affairs where a man has not been occupying his house, as in the case stated by him, for the period of a year past, that he can come into the District again, and add to the lack of housing by insisting on taking a house back which he had already rented and of which other people have been in possession? Of course, the Senator understands that the theory is that we are endeavoring to provide against a present condition; and if a man has rented his property for a year, has let somebody else have it, why should he be particularly tenderly dealt with when he comes back and adds to the general demand for houses?

Mr. FLETCHER. It may be that an owner of the property may have business in Washington which calls him back. It is entirely reasonable to assume that, as he is the owner of the property, having his home in Washington, and that he built the property in order that he might have a home, and he has some sort of right to come to his own home. It seems as though there might be a case of that sort, that a man has built a home for himself; he is temporarily away, and sees fit to rent it, or to rent a part of it even, to some one else, that lease expires on the 1st of October, we will say, and he then desires to and conceives the notion that he has a right to occupy his own home. It may be that he has some such right as that, absurd as it appears to the movers of this resolution.

I know that the effort is to reach profiteers; I am in hearty sympathy with that; I am in full accord with that. I believe every individual who has been guilty by exorbitant rent charges and that sort of thing of imposing upon the people resident in the District of Columbia and those who have come here, ought to be reached and ought to be dealt with in some adequate way; but this resolution does not accomplish anything of the kind in my judgment.

It is admitted here that most of the profiteering arises by reason of subletting. I know the answer to that is that the landlord under the usual form of lease has the right to object to subletting or, in other words, that the tenant can not sublet without the consent of the landlord; but suppose that last October a landlord rented an apartment or a residence to an individual, and that individual subsequently came to the landlord and said, "I desire to sublet these premises," giving some good reason, as he undoubtedly could in most instances; "the person to

whom I desire to sublet is an entirely respectable person, in good standing," and all that sort of thing, and the landlord, in an accommodating spirit, consented that that subletting might be made to the end of that lease. Now, Congress proposes to step in and say that that landlord can not withdraw that consent; he is to be bound to the end of the war to that consent. He only consented that the subletting might go on until the end of the lease; but it is proposed now that the tenant shall remain in possession of the property until the end of the war; the consent to sublet it is binding upon the tenant so long as the lease is binding upon the landlord, and there you are perpetuating an iniquity which you wished to stop. You propose to continue, you absolutely oblige a continuation of that relation between the tenant and the sublessee. I say that is unfair. And, furthermore, it defeats your object. Even if the landlord did consent to the subletting originally, it was for a limited time; and the consent never would have been given most likely if it had been understood that the lease was not to end in accordance with its terms. Congress proposes to step in and say that the lease shall continue indefinitely, to the end of the war, and that means that the tenant can go on with his subletting as he has done before. I say you do not by such legislation reach the situation which you are aiming at.

Mr. President, if it were a case, as I have said, of the landlord imposing upon people engaged in helping the Government in any way in this emergency, I would stand ready to cooperate with anyone in that direction; but in the instance mentioned by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY], the cases where persons are occupying premises who are not war workers and are not engaged in helping the Government. If this joint resolution were limited, if it could be limited, to cases of tenants who are serving the Government, I would not have the slightest objection to it, even if it did continue until the end of the war. It ought not to continue beyond the enactment of a bill such as that offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] and which has passed the Senate, but it is perfectly well known that that bill meets with opposition in the other body, and it is very doubtful if that legislation will ever be written upon the statute books. This is probably the only legislation that will be enacted upon this subject, and we must consider it from that standpoint.

If this joint resolution were limited to the end of this session of Congress, I would have no objection to it; if it were limited to cases where tenants occupying premises are engaged in work for the Government or employed by the Government, I would have no objection to it; but it is not limited in either respect. It covers all cases of people residing in Washington, not merely those at work for the Government, but those who are here because they like to be here, because, for instance, their relatives may be in the Army or Navy or in some office connected with the departments, and the mothers and sisters are here visiting them, or because they enjoy the society of Washington. Those are people you are taking care of under this joint resolution. If the joint resolution were confined to a prohibition regarding the disturbing of people who are serving the Government and employed by the Government, I should say, "Let it pass"; if it were confined to a definite period of time, if it were limited to this session of Congress, so that we might have fuller and more complete legislation on this subject, such as the Pomerene bill, I should say, "Let it pass"; but the prospect is that this is the only measure on this subject that will be enacted by Congress, and it does not accomplish what it was desired or intended to accomplish. It imposes unheard-of hardship and even confiscation upon property owners of this city; and, in my judgment, the conference report ought not to be agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have heretofore taken a little of the time of the Senate on this subject. I wish to say a final word by way of protest against the enactment of this character of legislation. Without hesitation, I declare that such a piece of legislation has never disfigured the statute books of a free country.

So far as the Washington profiteer is concerned, everybody believes that he is a disgrace to the city in which he lives. A man who has doubled his rent and then perhaps doubled it again is doing his city a disservice and is entitled to the contempt of all decent men. There ought to be a law passed that will reach him. Such a law can be passed without doing violence to the Constitution, for I have no doubt that in the District of Columbia Congress possesses a power of levying taxes which could be so employed as to take away entirely the profits of men who have charged excessive rents. If we could proceed in accordance with the Constitution, reaching these excessive rents in that way, I would be as willing to proceed along that line as any other man in this body; but, disguise it as we may, we are undertaking



here to abolish rights of property. I said a few days ago, and I venture to repeat, that the Soviet of Russia has attempted nothing more radical, nothing that more completely outrages the fundamental principles that must be in the very warp and woof and soul of free governments than does this joint resolution.

Let us see what you propose to do. You propose to say that a man who has bought a piece of property and who has paid for it, and who has leased that property for one month or a longer period, can not recover possession of that property so long as the tenant agrees to pay rent, until this war shall end? This war may not end for 10 years, but whether it shall last for 10 years or 10 months the principle is the same. You propose not only to violate the terms of contracts, but you propose to make new contracts for people—contracts that they never made in the world.

You had a house, and you rented it for 35 days, expecting at the end of the 35 days to resume possession of it, and along comes—what shall I say, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, or shall I say an aggregation of men who disregard the Constitution under which they pretend to assemble?—and these men say: "Notwithstanding the fact that this is your house, bought and paid for with your money, and leased for a limited period of 35 days, we hereby extend that lease, and make a new contract for you that may last for 10 years."

I defy any man in this Chamber to point to anything that has been done by that aggregation of insanity and imbecility and anarchy known as the Russian Soviet that goes further than this joint resolution; and I pause to have it pointed out. I challenge the authors of this joint resolution to point out the thing that has been done by that body relating to rights of property that goes further than this joint resolution goes. I am pausing for the reply. I am issuing the challenge to men who sit silent, whose tongues cleave to the roofs of their mouths.

Let me read a part of the joint resolution as it now comes back:

That until a treaty of peace shall have been definitely concluded between the United States and the Imperial German Government, unless in the meantime otherwise provided by Congress, no judicial order, decree, or judgment for the recovery of possession of any real estate in the District of Columbia, now or hereafter held or acquired by oral or written agreement of lease for one month or any longer period, or for the ejectment or dispossession of a tenant therefrom, shall be made, and all leases thereof shall continue so long as the tenant continues to pay rent at the agreed rate and performs the other conditions of the tenancy which are not inconsistent herewith.

Let me take my illustration and follow it. You own a house. You leased it for 35 days. You agreed to yield possession of that house for that 35 days and no longer, and to receive your pay for it. You intended at the end of that period to resume possession. You leased it to some individual, perhaps, who is here in town out of curiosity, an idler. You desire to lease it to a man engaged in the performance of responsible duties for the Government. Under those circumstances you find Members of the Senate deliberately devising a plan by which you will be denied any day in court, any chance in court, any opportunity in court, until this war shall end, to get possession of your property.

Senators think that they have arrived at some astute means of defeating the Constitution by saying that "we have only effected the remedy." Is it the business of Members of the Senate to devise means to cheat the Constitution, some shrewd and keen lawyerlike scheme so cunning that it will evade the plain terms of the Constitution? Let me say to the authors of this joint resolution that they have not succeeded, because the courts of law have in the past always said that while the remedy may be changed it can not be so changed as to be a denial of a remedy.

Think of the monstrous idea! You rented a house for 35 days. You may have rented it at half its value, and you may have rented it merely to have an occupant in it so that it would not be a vacant place, and the insurance would not be canceled. But now along come the authors of this joint resolution, and they propose that that rent shall continue for all time until the war is over. God knows when it will be. We hope and pray it will not be long; but I do not believe there is a thoroughly posted man connected with this Government, a man who has gone down to the bottom and root of things, who believes that this war will end within a very short period of time. For my own part, I look for three years at least of the fearful struggle. I could give you the reasons, and I shall in a day or two, if I have the privilege of addressing the Senate upon the war.

Follow a little further. There are some exceptions made to this. Some of these exceptions might cover the particular illustration I used, but they will not cover the general rights of property. Then we follow on. The provision is that where there has been an order, decree, or judgment—

Made but not executed before the passage of this resolution, the court by which the order, decree, or judgment was made shall, if it is of the opinion that the order, decree, or judgment would not have been made if this resolution had been in force at the date of the making of the order, decree, or judgment, rescind or modify the order, decree, or judgment in such manner as the court may deem proper for the purpose of giving effect to this resolution.

Now, let us stop and analyze that a little bit. We have a provision in the Constitution against ex post facto laws that I am aware has been construed as applied to criminal acts; but here is a provision for a court to render a decree such as it would have done if a law had been in existence that was not in existence when the decree was written. If that is not giving an ex post facto effect to a law, then, in the name of common sense, what is it?

Through the experience of the ages we have learned that one of the chief instruments of tyranny was to pass a law that would have a retroactive effect, a law that would affect the rights of human beings as they existed before the law had been enacted, a law that reached into the past and undid something that had been done, and properly done, and legally done, under the law as it then existed. This infamous measure, this measure that insults the intelligence of every lover of liberty in the world, proposes to say that a court having once rendered a decree—no matter though the term of court may have expired, and no matter though the question may no longer be in the bosom of the court—may render the decree now which it would have rendered if the law now in existence had been in existence at the time the decree was rendered. Is it not a shame to pass a law like that? Is it not a disgrace to pass a law like that? Is it not an absurdity to pass a law like that?

#### JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must ask the Senator from Missouri to reserve further remarks until later. The hour having arrived at which, in accordance with the concurrent resolution of the two Houses, the Senate is to proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives, there to listen to a communication of the President of the United States, the Sergeant at Arms will take charge of the proceedings.

Thereupon the Senate, preceded by its Sergeant at Arms, and headed by the Vice President and the Secretary, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

At 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m. the Senate returned to its Chamber, and the Vice President resumed the chair.

#### ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The address of the President of the United States this day delivered at a joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress is as follows:

GENTLEMEN OF THE CONGRESS: It is with unaffected reluctance that I come to ask you to prolong your session long enough to provide more adequate resources for the Treasury for the conduct of the war. I have reason to appreciate as fully as you do how arduous the session has been. Your labours have been severe and protracted. You have passed a long series of measures which required the debate of many doubtful questions of judgment and many exceedingly difficult questions of principle as well as of practice. The summer is upon us in which labour and counsel are twice arduous and are constantly apt to be impaired by lassitude and fatigue. The elections are at hand and we ought as soon as possible to go and render an intimate account of our trusteeship to the people who delegated us to act for them in the weighty and anxious matters that crowd upon us in these days of critical choice and action. But we dare not go to the elections until we have done our duty to the full. These are days when duty stands stark and naked and even with closed eyes we know it is there. Excuses are unavailing. We have either done our duty or we have not. The fact will be as gross and plain as the duty itself. In such a case lassitude and fatigue seem negligible enough. The facts are tonic and suffice to freshen the labour.

And the facts are these: Additional revenues must manifestly be provided for. It would be a most unsound policy to raise too large a proportion of them by loan, and it is evident that the four billions now provided for by taxation will not of themselves sustain the greatly enlarged budget to which we must immediately look forward. We cannot in fairness wait until the end of the fiscal year is at hand to apprise our people of the taxes they must pay on their earnings of the present calendar year, whose accountings and expenditures will then be closed. We can not get increased taxes unless the country knows what they are to be and practices the necessary economy to make them available. Definiteness, early definiteness, as to what its tasks are to be is absolutely necessary for the successful ad-

ministration of the Treasury; it cannot frame fair and workable regulations in haste; and it must frame its regulations in haste if it is not to know its exact task until the very eve of its performance. The present tax laws are marred, moreover, by inequities which ought to be remedied. Indisputable facts, every one; and we cannot alter or blink them. To state them is argument enough.

And yet perhaps you will permit me to dwell for a moment upon the situation they disclose. Enormous loans freely spent in the stimulation of industry of almost every sort produce inflations and extravagances which presently make the whole economic structure questionable and insecure and the very basis of credit is cut away. Only fair, equitably distributed taxation, of the widest incidence and drawing chiefly from the sources which would be likely to demoralize credit by their very abundance, can prevent inflation and keep our industrial system free of speculation and waste. We shall naturally turn, therefore, I suppose, to war profits and incomes and luxuries for the additional taxes. But the war profits and incomes upon which the increased taxes will be levied will be the profits and incomes of the calendar year 1918. It would be manifestly unfair to wait until the early months of 1919 to say what they are to be. It might be difficult, I should imagine, to run the mill with water that had already gone over the wheel.

Moreover, taxes of that sort will not be paid until the June of next year, and the Treasury must anticipate them. It must use the money they are to produce before it is due. It must sell short-time certificates of indebtedness. In the autumn a much larger sale of long-time bonds must be effected than has yet been attempted. What are the bankers to think of the certificates if they do not certainly know where the money is to come from which is to take them up? And how are investors to approach the purchase of bonds with any sort of confidence or knowledge of their own affairs if they do not know what taxes they are to pay and what economies and adjustments of their business they must effect? I cannot assure the country of a successful administration of the Treasury in 1918 if the question of further taxation is to be left undecided until 1919.

The consideration that dominates every other now, and makes every other seem trivial and negligible, is the winning of the war. We are not only in the midst of the war, we are at the very peak and crisis of it. Hundreds of thousands of our men, carrying our hearts with them and our fortunes, are in the field, and ships are crowding faster and faster to the ports of France and England with regiment after regiment, thousand after thousand, to join them until the enemy shall be beaten and brought to a reckoning with mankind. There can be no pause or intermission. The great enterprise must, on the contrary, be pushed with greater and greater energy. The volume of our might must steadily and rapidly be augmented until there can be no question of resisting it. If that is to be accomplished, gentlemen, money must sustain it to the utmost. Our financial programme must no more be left in doubt or suffered to lag than our ordnance programme or our ship programme or our munitions programme or our programme for making millions of men ready. These others are not programmes, indeed, but mere plans upon paper, unless there is to be an unquestionable supply of money.

That is the situation, and it is the situation which creates the duty, no choice or preference of ours. There is only one way to meet that duty. We must meet it without selfishness or fear of consequences. Politics is adjourned. The elections will go to those who think least of it; to those who go to the constituencies without explanations or excuses, with a plain record of duty faithfully and disinterestedly performed. I, for one, am always confident that the people of this country will give a just verdict upon the service of the men who act for them when the facts are such that no man can disguise or conceal them. There is no danger of deceit now. An intense and pitiless light beats upon every man and every action in this tragic plot of war that is now upon the stage. If lobbyists hurry to Washington to attempt to turn what you do in the matter of taxation to their protection or advantage, the light will beat also upon them. There is abundant fuel for the light in the records of the Treasury with regard to profits of every sort. The profiteering that can not be got at by the restraints of conscience and love of country can be got at by taxation. There is such profiteering now and the information with regard to it is available and indisputable.

I am advising you to act upon this matter of taxation now, gentlemen, not because I do not know that you can see and interpret the facts and the duty they impose just as well and with as clear a perception of the obligations involved as I can, but because there is a certain solemn satisfaction in sharing with you the responsibilities of such a time. The world never stood in such case before. Men never before had so clear or

so moving a vision of duty. I know that you will begrudge the work to be done here by us no more than the men begrudge us theirs who lie in the trenches and sally forth to their death. There is a stimulating comradeship knitting us all together. And this task to which I invite your immediate consideration will be performed under favourable influences if we will look to what the country is thinking and expecting and care nothing at all for what is being said and believed in the lobbies of Washington hotels, where the atmosphere seems to make it possible to believe what is believed nowhere else.

Have you not felt the spirit of the nation rise and its thought become a single and common thought since these eventful days came in which we have been sending our boys to the other side? I think you must read that thought, as I do, to mean this, that the people of this country are not only united in the resolute purpose to win this war but are ready and willing to bear any burden and undergo any sacrifice that it may be necessary for them to bear in order to win it. We need not be afraid to tax them, if we lay taxes justly. They know that the war must be paid for and that it is they who must pay for it, and if the burden is justly distributed and the sacrifice made a common sacrifice from which none escapes who can bear it at all, they will carry it cheerfully and with a sort of solemn pride. I have always been proud to be an American, and was never more proud than now, when all that we have said and all that we have foreseen about our people is coming true. The great days have come when the only thing that they ask for or admire is duty greatly and adequately done; when their only wish for America is that she may share the freedom she enjoys; when a great, compelling sympathy wells up in their hearts for men everywhere who suffer and are oppressed; and when they see at last the high uses for which their wealth has been piled up and their mighty power accumulated and, counting neither blood nor treasure now that their final day of opportunity has come, rejoice to spend and to be spent through a long night of suffering and terror in order that they and men everywhere may see the dawn of a day of righteousness and justice and peace. Shall we grow weary when they bid us act?

May I add this word, gentlemen? Just as I was leaving the White House I was told that the expected drive on the western front had apparently begun. You can realize how that solemnized my feeling as I came to you, and how it seemed to strengthen the purpose which I have tried to express in these lines.

I have admired the work of this session. The way in which the two Houses of the Congress have cooperated with the Executive has been generous and admirable, and it is not in any spirit of suggesting duty neglected, but only to remind you of the common cause and the common obligation that I have ventured to come to you to-day.

#### DISTRICT RENT ADMINISTRATOR—CONFERENCE REPORT.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 152) to prevent rent profiteering in the District of Columbia.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire for a few moments to resume my remarks. I call attention to another clause in this remarkable joint resolution, and I ask if such a provision as this was ever written into a law before—

and all remedies, at law or in equity, of the lessor based on any provision in any oral or written agreement of lease that the same shall be determined or forfeited if the premises shall be sold are hereby suspended while this resolution shall be in force, and every purchaser shall take the conveyance of any premises subject to the rights of all tenants in possession thereof under the provisions of this resolution.

So that if a man has obtained a lease upon a piece of property with the express understanding that if the owner desires to sell that property the lease will be terminated, he now finds himself in the position that Congress has annulled and destroyed that provision, and even though he sell his property he can not acquire possession of it! If that be not the destruction of property rights, then property rights can not be destroyed. It is not a law merely affecting a remedy; it is a law denying a remedy, and a law denying a remedy where property rights are involved in itself is a denial of property rights.

Mr. President, we may discuss these questions to the empty benches of the Senate, but I say to the Senate we shall with very poor grace prosecute a man for denouncing the Constitution of the United States, as we have provided under the espionage act he may be prosecuted, if we, at the same time, sitting in this high place, ourselves ravish the Constitution and do it without a pretense of justification.

I repeat in part what I said a few days ago, lest some Senator may not have had his mind directed to the particular thought. The day is coming when there will be hardships in



this land, when there will be suffering, and when all those turbulent elements of society who seek in the face of suffering to accomplish remedies by a disregard of law and disregard of constitutions, will be possibly in the ascendancy numerically in this country; there will come a day after this war is over when privation and want will be not uncommon strangers in the cities and hamlets of our country. When that time does come, and come it will, there will come also the doctrinaire who preaches that property should be divided, that property rights should not any longer be regarded, and when that man comes and tells us that the hour has struck when, in order to alleviate human suffering, we must disregard the Constitution; he will point to the record made by the Senate to-day, a record that disregards property rights for reasons that are trivial. The day will come when more extreme individuals will insist that the decrees of courts should not be regarded, and when that day does come the soap-box anarchist who announces that doctrine under a red flag can point to the action of the United States Senate taken with reference to the mere matter of rent profiteering in the city of Washington. The day will come when some wretch, when perhaps many wretches, will desire to pass laws, retroactive in their nature, affecting the property of individuals and destroying rights that have already accrued and that have already been fully recognized, and when this enemy of law and order and of civilization makes his plea he can point to the action of the United States Senate solemnly declaring that the solemn judgments of courts can be set aside and a new judgment rendered in accordance with a law that did not exist when the original judgment was entered.

I may stand here now and say this to empty benches and to men who are afflicted with a sort of madness that I can not understand; but the day will come when the lovers of liberty will charge us with having sown the dragon's teeth from which an army of anarchists have sprung up. The day will come when those who would do violence to law, to constitutions, and to civilization will plant themselves upon the ground you to-day occupy, and from that ground they will defy you in the name of this precedent, they will sanctify the villainy of their hearts and the evil purposes of their counsels.

The President has not asked you to do this. So often men undertake to sanctify their acts under the claim that the President has asked it. One law was proposed here that sought to strike down the civil tribunals of our country, and the President denounced it because it violated the Constitution and in bitter language declared that it would be worthy of Prussia. That was a law that denied the civil courts in criminal cases their just jurisdiction. This is a law that denies the civil courts in civil cases their just jurisdiction. If you tell me that it applies only to the District of Columbia, I answer: If the Congress of the United States, being the supreme legislative body of the District of Columbia, shall violate the Constitution that every Member of Congress swore he would uphold, then what shall you expect from the legislatures of States? And if we violate the Constitution, what shall you expect from the ignorant, from the unlettered, from the men who come here from foreign countries? If we write into our laws the infamous and damnable doctrine that a court can set aside its judgment that was passed under a state of laws that existed, and can now revise that judgment and enter a decree in accordance with the law that we are about to pass now—if we do that, then I say that we have written across the face of liberty the word "dishonor."

The President does not ask it. He tells you that there is profiteering in this land, but he does not tell you to ravish the Constitution. In his message just delivered, the way is suggested. It is a way that has already been discussed upon this floor. Let me read it to you:

The profiteering that can not be got at by the restraints of conscience and love of country can be got at by taxation.

That is a legal way to get at it. That is a constitutional way to get at it. Why do not the authors of this measure pursue that course? If there are men in the city of Washington who are raising their rent two or three times beyond what is fair and reasonable, let a simple tax provision be drawn that will be so heavy that the profiteer will find that all his profits are carried into the Federal Treasury, and he will cease robbing tenants, for it will put no money in his purse.

I read again what the President says:

The profiteering that can not be got at by the restraints of conscience and love of country can be got at by taxation.

We have been told that this joint resolution is only temporary; that while by its terms it lasts until the end of the war, a law is to be passed that will reach this question from another angle. Mr. President, I think that law will never see the light

of day, once this joint resolution is passed, until in the due course of time some judge shall disregard popular clamor, some judge shall turn his back upon those who would pursue their way, even though they do it over the broken pillars of the temple of law and liberty, some judge shall lay his hand upon this measure and write across it the word "unconstitutional." Then, perhaps, there will be another attempt similar to this.

I repeat what I have said so often: No man desires to go further than I do to stop rent profiteering in the city of Washington. The man who seeks to make exorbitant profits out of this war is unworthy the name of American citizen. The rent hog is as contemptible an animal as ever disgraced a civilized community; but because there are rent hogs in Washington, I decline to strike down a Constitution that it took thousands of years of human effort to indite and to have finally adopted. Can we not come to the proposition of taxing these profiteers so that they will find it unprofitable to profiteer?

Mr. BORAH rose.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have concluded my remarks. Before the Senator from Idaho begins, I desire to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, before that suggestion is made, may I ask whether the Senator in charge of this measure desires to dispose of it immediately?

Mr. SAULSBURY. Just as soon as possible, Mr. President.

Mr. BORAH. I am not about to address myself to this particular subject, but to another subject, and I do not want to take advantage of it if the Senator wishes to dispose of this proposition.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I am very anxious to do so; and I will say to the Senator that one reason is that there are many cases of this rent profiteering which may become effective if this joint resolution is not adopted and in effect before the 1st of June. Therefore I am anxious to get it through, so that it can be signed by the President immediately, if he sees fit.

Mr. BORAH. I suppose we ought to have a quorum.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I should think so.

Mr. BORAH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, before the Senator makes that suggestion, out of order I desire to make a motion that a report filed by the Secretary of Agriculture some time since, in response to a resolution of the Senate—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I make the point of order that nothing can be legally done after the absence of a quorum has been suggested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILFLEY in the chair). The point of order is well taken.

Mr. SHIELDS. I ask the Senator to withhold his suggestion or to withdraw it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That can not be done. It is in the record.

Mr. SHIELDS. I suppose the Senator can withdraw it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll. The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Borah	Henderson	Nugent	Smith, S. C.
Brandagee	Hitchcock	Overman	Smoot
Calder	Johnson, Cal.	Page	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Johnson, S. D.	Penrose	Thomas
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	Thompson
Cummins	Kellogg	Poinexter	Trammell
Curtis	Kendrick	Pomerene	Underwood
Dillingham	Kenyon	Reed	Vardaman
Fall	King	Saulsbury	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Lewis	Sheppard	Walsh
France	McLean	Sherman	Warren
Gallinger	McNary	Shields	Willey
Guion	Myers	Simmons	
Harding	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.	
Hardwick	Norris	Smith, Md.	

Mr. SHIELDS. I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. McKellar] is absent on official business. I wish to have this announcement stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-seven Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, having just entered the Chamber may I ask what conference report is this?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the conference report on the joint resolution to prevent rent profiteering in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator from Delaware if the conference report has been printed?

Mr. SAULSBURY. The report has not been printed. The conference report was agreed to by the House of Representatives on Saturday, I think, and was sent over here, and the Senate report was made this morning.

Mr. GALLINGER. What about the time limit concerning which there has been some controversy?

Mr. SAULSBURY. There have been only two amendments made that amount to anything. One was to reduce the time limit to the actual period of the war, cutting off the year after the war which the House provided for, and the other was to correct the phraseology in regard to the leases, confining it solely to leases. Those are practically the only two amendments.

Mr. GALLINGER. So that if the war should continue for 5 years or 10 years this statute will continue in force?

Mr. SAULSBURY. Unless Congress otherwise provided in the meantime, which of course it could do anyway.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; but which the Senator knows Congress probably will not do.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I can not agree to that, Mr. President, because I sincerely hope, and I think every member of the District of Columbia Committee hopes, that Congress will provide a very comprehensive remedy.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, that doubtless is the opinion of the Senator from Delaware, but some of us know to the contrary. This report ought to have been printed, so as to give us an opportunity to examine it. I will suggest to the Senator from Delaware that that is the usual course, and it ought to have been followed in this case.

Mr. SAULSBURY. If I may interrupt the Senator, unanimous consent was given to proceed to the consideration of the conference report, as I understand it. At any rate the Senate directed that we should proceed to its consideration, and it seems to be no good object can be served by delay. It is very important from the standpoint of people who believe that this legislation should be passed that it should be passed as quickly as possible, and before the 1st of June.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the joint resolution is not going to do me any particular good or any great harm personally. So I would not oppose it or advocate it from any selfish standpoint; but I have very serious apprehension that it is bad legislation and that it will do a great deal of harm to a great many good people in the District of Columbia. On that point I may be mistaken, but I believe not. There is certainly a very wide difference of opinion as to that matter. However, if unanimous consent has been given to proceed with the conference report, I certainly can find no fault with the procedure.

In this morning's mail I received a letter from a friend of mine, a man who has resided in this District for a great many years, a man of affairs, of large business, and while he did not ask me to have it put in the Record, neither did he suggest that I should not so use it. I confess that in the strain and stress of legislative business which has been upon some of us, especially those of us who have been struggling with the District of Columbia appropriation bill, I have not had time to give to the consideration of this matter the attention that its importance deserves. I will ask that the letter that I have alluded to be read by the Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 27, 1918.

Hon. JACOB H. GALLINGER,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: May I trouble you to read the inclosed correspondence relative to the Atlantic Building?

Up to three years ago the Forestry Bureau was paying us \$24,000 a year. At that time when business was fearfully depressed in Washington, no demand for offices, and offices being given up, the Forestry Bureau served notice on us that unless the rent was reduced to \$18,000 they would move out. We were compelled to accept. Under the operation of that lease, owing to the increased cost in maintenance we were unable to pay, the first year and a half more than a fraction over 1 per cent and the second year and a half we were losers of about \$2,000.

If the Saulsbury resolution passes the shareholders of the Atlantic Building Co. will be deprived of all income, and in addition thereto will be called on to make up a deficit of about \$4,000 a year. No greater injustice, I am sure you will agree with me, could be inflicted upon innocent and dependent people.

For my own offices I pay \$1.35 per square foot. The Government is paying at the Atlantic Building a fraction over 51 cents. It seems as if Congress is about to make a law that will protect the Government from being robbed and at the same time to enact a law that will permit the Government to rob other people. I do not know if anything can be done now, Senator, but if it can I am sure your great sense of justice and right will interest itself.

Yours, very truly,

MYRON M. PARKER.

P. S.—There is nothing in the Saulsbury resolution that would prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from increasing the rent in the Atlantic Building, but the question is, Will he do it?

M. M. P.

Mr. GALLINGER. There is a letter attached which I should like to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Hon. BEN JOHNSON,  
House of Representatives, City.

MARCH 9, 1918.

DEAR SIR: In 1900 when I was elected president of the Atlantic Building Co., a large office building, as you know, on F Street, between Ninth and Tenth Streets NW., it was then occupied by commercial tenants, with the exception of two floors which were used by the Indian Office. The rental at that time was a little in excess of \$37,500 a year.

At a later period the Indian Office moved out into the old post-office building. An application was at once made by the Bureau of Forestry for some of the space left vacant by the Indian Office. At that time the Forestry Bureau only occupied three or four small rooms in the old Department of Agriculture Building.

We made a lease with the Forestry Bureau for space required by them on one of the vacant floors, and at the request of the bureau it was stipulated that further space should be given as required. We little thought at that time that the requirements of the bureau would reach beyond the two vacant floors for many years, but the growth of the bureau was phenomenal, and from time to time within a very limited period further space was required until we were compelled to dispossess old and reliable tenants who had been in the building since its construction. This continued until the entire building was vacated for the use of the Forestry Bureau, with the exception of two stories on the first floor and a small room in the back. It was also stipulated in the lease that as further space was required it should be at the same rent as originally agreed upon.

By this agreement the Forestry Bureau were able to occupy the building at an annual rental of \$24,000, as against \$37,500 we were obtaining when they first moved in.

Three years ago on the 30th of next June the lease of the Forestry Bureau expired, and that at a time when great business depression prevailed in Washington, and there was little or no demand for office space. Evidently taking advantage of this, the bureau served notice on the Atlantic Building Co. that unless the rent was reduced to \$18,000 a year they would move out. There seeming to be no alternative at that time, and not desiring to have a vacant building, we entered into a lease on these terms.

Under the provisions of this lease we were unable to pay the first two years more than 1 per cent dividend to the shareholders. Owing to the marked increased cost of operations, coal, and the salary of the employees, the company will lose on this last year tenancy over \$1,900.

The stock of the Atlantic Building Co. is largely held by small beneficiaries of estates, many of whom are women and largely dependent on the income from their stock in this building. Among these beneficiaries, I might say, are the granddaughters of the late Dr. Garnett, who, as you may remember, was a distinguished surgeon in the Confederate Army. Should this bill be enacted into law you will readily see what great hardship and injustice it would inflict on these shareholders. Even at an increase of 10 per cent on the present rental of \$18,000 no dividend could be paid to the shareholders during the continuance of the lease. If expenses of operations should continue to increase, it would be operated at a loss, as it has done during the past year.

I, therefore, as president of the Atlantic Building Co., charged with representing their interests, appeal to you to so amend your bill as to enable the beneficiaries to receive a fair return on their investment and relieve the Atlantic Building Co. of the burden that would be cast upon it.

The Atlantic Building is easily worth to-day \$500,000.

Very truly, yours,

MYRON M. PARKER,  
President Atlantic Building Co.

Mr. HARDWICK obtained the floor.

Mr. SAULSBURY. May I say to the Senator from New Hampshire that the president of the Atlantic Building Co. was before the committee and gave all the facts in regard to the building. The joint resolution does not stop him from making with the Secretary of Agriculture a fair lease if the Secretary is willing to do it. I think there is some question about whether the present terms of the lease are fair or not. The committee has taken up many of these particular cases and has unanimously come to the conclusion that a joint resolution of this kind should be passed, as well as the law which is proposed to make a comprehensive system of legislation on the subject.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to ask the Senator from Delaware—

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, have I not the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has been recognized.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I beg the Senator's pardon if I inadvertently began to speak in his time.

Mr. HARDWICK. That is all right. The Senator knows that I am always glad to yield to any Senator, but I have only a few words to say and I thought I would get rid of them.

Mr. President, I do not know on what theory this resolution was framed or on what theory it is presented to the Senate unless it is upon the theory that we no longer have a written Constitution and that none of its guarantees are in force, because there is no lawyer of intelligence who has considered this question carefully who will, in my judgment, contend for one moment that this proposition does not violate the provisions of the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, what is the proposition that is submitted to us? It is simply this, that when anybody in the District of Columbia has either orally or by written contract rented premises in the District for a period of as much as one month or longer, although the contract may provide that the term of the lease is only three months, it shall be continued indefinitely at the option of the lessee, without regard to the rights of the



lessor and without compensation even if it can be shown as a matter of fact that he is entitled to more, and without regard to the provisions of the fifth amendment, which provides for the protection of life and property all over the United States and even in the District of Columbia, and without even a pretense that the property is taken for a public use under the provisions of the fifth amendment, and without, of course, providing for any sort of process of law to ascertain what is the value of the property so commandeered.

Mr. President, I venture the assertion that no court in this country ever called upon to pass on this question will ever uphold any of its provisions. As long as the Constitution of the United States is in force and my oath to support it and obey it and uphold it dwells within the chambers of my memory, so long will I find it impossible to vote for a proposition that I know is so utterly abhorrent to the provisions of the Constitution that I have sworn to support.

Not only that, Mr. President, but let me invite the attention of the Senate again to another remarkable proposition; that is, the retroactive feature of this resolution. Anybody in the District of Columbia, whether sojourning here from caprice or for pleasure, for social reasons or whatnot, who happens to have rented a piece of property for as much as one month or longer, either by written agreement or by oral contract, if such person desires to keep the property he can keep it at the same rate fixed in the short period for which he may have rented it as long as this war shall last.

Not only that, but provision is made that this law shall be enforced retroactively—shall be applied to contracts made before its enactment. Let me read the language:

And where such order, decree, or judgment has been made but not executed before the passage of this resolution the court by which the order, decree, or judgment was made shall, if it is of the opinion that the order, decree, or judgment would not have been made if this resolution had been in force at the date of the making of the order, decree, or judgment, rescind or modify the order, decree, or judgment in such manner as the court may deem proper for the purpose of giving effect to this resolution.

Clearly an ex post facto application. You are going to turn around, even when the parties have gone to the courts for their remedy before this statute was enacted, and say we will give it an ex post facto application, and if the courts were of the opinion that this thing would have fallen within the terms of this legislation before the date of its enactment, then the same rule established by this legislation for other transactions shall apply to past transactions.

Gentlemen, it would be an insult, as I view it, to the intelligence of this body if I were to argue any such proposition. Surely we are not so excited and hysterical that we can believe that measures of this sort are worth the paper they are written on or that the courts anywhere in an Anglo-Saxon country where love of justice and the fundamental principles of a wise jurisprudence prevails will enforce any such proposition as this. I hate to see the Senate seriously asked to commit itself to the enactment of legislation of this character.

Mr. President, we are, of course, laboring under some excitement. Hysteria stalks abroad in the land, and naturally so; but surely this body, unless we are prepared to abandon the fundamentals in which we have always believed, unless we are prepared to renounce the principles upon which our jurisprudence rests and upon which our civilization itself is built, will not seriously consider this sort of a proposition.

Mr. President, I have no doubt that under the war power the Government in a time of war can commandeer any sort of property it needs, whether that property is real or personal; and if it be real property, whether it is an estate of freehold or leasehold; but it can only commandeer property for a public use. It can not commandeer property for private uses. It can not condemn A's property to give it to B, either perpetually or for a period of time, either for a high price or for a low price.

The fifth amendment provides that private property may be taken for public uses, and even then not without just compensation. Just compensation for the use of property is not some yardstick that is set up by legislative decree, not some rental that may be fixed even for a limited period of time by private contract between the parties, applicable only to that period of time, but just compensation for private property that is taken for public uses means what the property is really worth as determined by a court and jury under due process of law.

If it were necessary, and it may be undoubtedly, the Government of the United States can condemn every estate of freehold and leasehold in the District of Columbia even to house the workers in the civil department of the Government whose services are necessary for the maintenance and operation of the Government and the conduct of the war, although not directly related to it; but surely it can go no further than that. Surely

it can not commandeer any more than a State legislature can commandeer A's property to give it to B for any stated sum or for any given period of time.

So if we are to do anything about this question, and I think possibly we ought to do something, we ought to provide a very simple piece of legislation which will authorize the Government to commandeer for the use of its own employees whose services are indispensable to its conduct and to the conduct of the war estates of freehold or leasehold, and then provide the value of those estates, whether taken for one month, one year, or one century, shall be that just compensation that a court and jury may determine. When we have done that we will have exhausted our power. When we have done that we will have provided an adequate remedy for any evil that may exist. When we undertake to do more than that we utterly defeat the purposes we profess to serve, because we pass an act, if we pass it at all, that no court can enforce or will enforce.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, the purpose of the Senator from Delaware, who I understand is the author of the resolution—

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Brandegge	Hitchcock	Penrose	Sutherland
Calder	Johnson, Cal.	Polindexter	Thomas
Chamberlain	Johnson, S. Dak.	Ransdell	Thompson
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Saulsbury	Townsend
Curtis	Kenyon	Shafroth	Trammell
Fletcher	McCumber	Sheppard	Underwood
France	McNary	Sherman	Wadsworth
Frelinghuysen	Martin	Shields	Warren
Gallinger	Norris	Smith, Ariz.	Willey
Gronna	Nugent	Smith, Mich.	
Gulon	Page	Smoot	

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My colleague, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF], is absent on account of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-two Senators have answered to their names—less than a quorum. The Secretary will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators and Mr. BORAH, Mr. HARDING, Mr. HARDWICK, Mr. KELLOGG, and Mr. REED answered to their names when called.

Mr. FALL, Mr. SMITH of Maryland, Mr. POMERENE, Mr. PHELAN, Mr. KIRBY, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. KING, and Mr. SMITH of South Carolina entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. NUGENT. I wish to announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-eight Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] is entitled to the floor and will proceed.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I was about to remark when the call for a quorum intervened that the purpose of the author of the joint resolution is fairly clear, and I am quite ready to say that it is a laudable purpose; but the manner in which the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] has worked out his purpose it is impossible for me to approve. What is desired, undoubtedly, is to secure a reasonable rental upon that part of the property in the District of Columbia which is subject to rent. I am sorry the Senator from Delaware is not in the Chamber at this moment, because I should like to have him either affirm or disaffirm that proposition. I, however, will assume that his object was to protect those who are compelled to rent property in the District of Columbia from unreasonable exactions on the part of those who own the property. It was evidently the purpose of the author of the joint resolution to take away from the owner of property the right which he ordinarily has to determine at what rate he will allow some one else to use it.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I merely desire to say that the Senator from Delaware stepped out just a moment ago and stated that he would return in a very few moments.

Mr. CUMMINS. I know that he can be easily informed of what I am saying, so I shall not pause, for I do not intend to say anything he would not be glad to hear.

There is but one way in which the right of an owner of property to determine what he shall receive for it in the event of its rental can be taken from the owner. I believe in a system in the present emergency which will not allow the owner of property, either for rental or for sale, to determine conclusively what it shall be rented for or what it shall be sold for, but I

hope that some attention will be given to the fundamental law of the land in pursuing the object we have in view. In this joint resolution no attention whatsoever, in my opinion, has been given to the guide or the restrictions of the Constitution. That, however, is not the point that I have particularly in mind and which I desire to lay before the members of the committee who reported the joint resolution which is now before us, in the hope that we may secure some readjustment or rearrangement of the proposed legislation.

I am willing that we shall take away—I think we ought to take away—the right of the landlord to determine finally what shall be paid for premises that are needed in the prosecution of the war; but what justification is there—and I put this now in all seriousness to Senators—in a case in which the Government does not want the property for taking away from the landlord the right to determine who shall occupy the premises and who shall pay the rent which is determined upon? That is just as important a right as is the right to determine how much shall be paid.

While I do not think that the Congress has any constitutional power to say that the rent for the future shall be measured by the rent for the past, I can not conceive that we have any power of that kind; yet grant it, let us admit, for the purposes of argument, that Congress has the right to say to the property owners of the District: "You shall charge no more for your premises under lease than you have charged in some former period"; let us admit that, although I do not think it can be justified by any principle of law with which this country is familiar; but let us take the next step. How can you justify or defend the proposition that you will take away from the landlord not only the right to determine the value of his premises but that you will take away from him the right to determine who shall occupy the premises? Are you assuming that those who occupy the rented property in the District of Columbia are the persons above all other persons who ought to occupy the property? Are you assuming that those who now enjoy the possession of rented buildings, rented apartments, and the like, are the persons whose possession of that property will most greatly contribute to the prosecution of the war or to the welfare of the country? It is monstrous to assume any such thing as that.

I can understand how a Senator who already has rented his apartment, if he lives in an apartment, is entirely satisfied with legislation of this character; but suppose there be a Senator here who has yet to rent an apartment for the coming year, are you going to inflict upon him the injustice of saying that no landlord can rent property to him at a given price, if there happens to be a tenant already in possession of the property whose right to occupy it expires, we will say, on the 1st of October? It is a most absurd proposal. It is outrageously unjust to say that those who are not so favored as to be in possession of a property which they desire to occupy on the 1st of October shall have no opportunity whatever to invoke the unquestionable right of the landlord to determine as between two persons who shall receive a lease.

I agree that if there are two persons, both intending to rent property, one of whom is necessary to the Government in the prosecution of the war, or in any other important function of the Government, he ought to have the preference; and those who are here without any real reason ought to be excluded; but this joint resolution does not provide for anything of that kind. On the contrary, this joint resolution makes secure the possession of thousands of men and women in the city of Washington who ought not to be here at all; who have no connection with the Government; whose presence is not necessary to anything the Government is doing. Tell me why it is desired to legislate those persons into permanent occupancy of the buildings in the District of Columbia, excluding those who live in the District, and may be vastly more essential to the things we are attempting to do than those who are already in those buildings and apartments?

I do not know that the joint resolution does in its essence any injustice to landlords in so far as the amount of the rent is concerned; I do not know anything about that. I do feel, however, that we are erecting a standard here that is not recognized by the law, and which the first court that has an opportunity to approach the subject will overturn. But I pass that.

Why do you do injustice to those who want to rent property at the standard which may be fixed in the joint resolution? Why are you not content to say that rentals of property in the District of Columbia shall not be greater than as stipulated in the leases now in force or in existence? In that way the title of the joint resolution would be fulfilled—that is, it is assumed it would be fulfilled—because the title of the joint resolution is to prevent profiteering.

Well, is it profiteering for a landlord when, at the expiration of the lease which may now be in existence, to choose Mr. Jones as his tenant instead of Mr. Smith, who is now in possession at the same rental? There is no profiteering in that instance. It is simply leaving the landlord the right to select his tenant until the Government shall intervene and say the property is needed for governmental purposes; and there is no provision in the joint resolution for any contingency of that kind. There is a provision in the joint resolution that one can not be evicted under any circumstances if his work is necessary to the Government; but the point that I make is not provided for in the joint resolution in anyway. I protest against attempting to exclude from the opportunity to negotiate and contract with the landlord at a given rental, if you please, all those who are not in possession under a lease of property in this District. Such a thing as this was never heard of before. If anyone had suggested that a proposal of this kind could find even toleration in the Senate of the United States, I would have laughed at him, for we are here not only attempting to regulate the amount that shall be paid for rented premises but we are attempting to describe those who are to occupy the premises as well, even though they have nothing whatsoever to do with the Government, and even though their presence in the city of Washington or in the District of Columbia is harmful rather than helpful.

I sincerely hope that those Senators who have been standing for the joint resolution, with an object in view in which we all concur, will at least permit a revision of the joint resolution, so that it will control only the amount of rental, and will not control the persons who are to occupy the buildings or the grounds, as the case may be.

There is but one way in which to accomplish this change, and that is by defeating the conference report; and I for one hope that it will be defeated, so that some people whom I know very well, who really desire to rent property after the 1st of October, and whose presence in Washington is quite as necessary as that of a great many who now occupy premises, may have at least an opportunity to invoke the choice of the owners of the property at the rental which may be determined by this act.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I had not intended to say a word on this subject. I feel, however, in justice to the members of the District Committee, that I ought to speak briefly. Allow me to say preliminarily that I realize that this joint resolution is not a complete piece of legislation. The District Committee took this matter up as seriously as any committee ever took up any piece of legislation. They reported a bill which passed the Senate, and is now awaiting the action of the other House. In the midst of our deliberations we were confronted by the fact that there were not only hundreds but thousands of tenants in this District who would be dispossessed on June 1, thrown bodily into the streets, unless they submitted to the exactions of a lot of profiteering landlords. Let us keep that fact before us when we are considering what we are going to do with the pending joint resolution.

There is a great deal of force in what the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] has said about the right of a landlord to say who shall occupy his building, but we must not forget that up to date the landlords have decided who their tenants should be, and those tenants up to this date have been paying very liberal rentals. Now, while some of these landlords think they have the opportunity to throw their tenants whom they selected into the street or compel them to pay an increase of from 33½ to 100 per cent in their rents, and while some of them are acting like Shylocks, we have technical objections raised here. Some Senators refuse to support the conference report because here and there it may result in injustice, and lose sight of the fact that if it is not passed thousands will be thrown into the street.

Mr. President, there has been a good deal said about the Constitution. With all due respect to those who are raising the question of the unconstitutionality of this act, I love that old instrument just as much as they do, but I am not so obsessed with the idea that I have so much more learning in my cranium that I am going to consign everybody to the bowwows because he does not agree with me upon the subject.

I do not believe that a court is going to hold this joint resolution unconstitutional. If I did so believe, I would not vote for it; and those Senators who believe that it is unconstitutional ought not, out of respect to their oaths, to vote for it; but I am not going to surrender my judgment because I am being anathematized on account of difference of opinion.

Some time ago we passed the civil-rights bill; we have suspended remedies against our soldiers and sailors; and the same constitutional authorities that we hear every day when a constitutional question comes up condemned that measure and insisted that the families of soldiers and sailors should be at the



mercy of creditors while they were fighting our battles along the battle line. In my humble judgment, this Government has the power to do anything within the limits of the Constitution which may be necessary for the defense of our Government.

Now, let us see what the situation is here in the District. In the first place, the Constitution of the United States gives to the Congress of the United States absolute legislative authority over persons and property in the District, and the only limitations upon that authority are those contained in the Constitution itself. By common consent of everybody, save only those who find constitutional objections to everything, we have the right to pass moratorium laws. We did it during the Civil War. Even the States passed such laws, though their powers were more limited than the powers of Congress over the District. And, again, during the present war in many of the States moratorium laws have been passed to protect the families of the soldiers.

It is said, however, that this measure is not limited to the families of soldiers. That is true; but let me suggest in time of war is it not necessary to the welfare of the Government that its employees be properly housed who are in the Treasury Department, or in the State Department, or in the Post Office Department? Will it not add to our efficiency in war if all the Government employees are not left to the tender mercies of those who would exact the pound of flesh?

While there are some people in this District who ought not to be here, there are many other people in the employment of stores and private firms and none of them could be dispensed with in this time of war, because the families of the Government employees must be properly served at their groceries, at their clothing establishments, at all the mercantile establishments of the District. Shall they be left without protection when there is no one save Congress to protect them?

This is the situation, and Senators may take their choice: Shall we hold before ourselves the inalienable right of a profiteering landlord to say, "I want Jones to get out of my house in order that I can put Smith in," when his real reason for making a change is because he expects to get twice the amount of rent out of Smith that he got out of Jones? Shall we hold that "it is nominated in the bond" of the Constitution that the landlord shall do with his own that which he pleases and ignore the rights of the tenant? Shall the Senate of the United States say to the thousands of Government employees and other people of modest means who live within the District, "Go into the street; my views of the Constitution are such that I can not and will not give you relief"?

Now, Senators, what is to be done? I have hope that within a few days the Members of the other House will come to the conclusion that they must meet us in conference, and I have hope that we are going to agree on a measure. I am not willing now to say that the Congress of the United States will continue unreasonably to quibble over differences of views while many of the people of the District are on the streets.

Mr. President, when the civil-rights bill was before the House that very able lawyer in the House, Mr. WEBB, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a report. I wish to read just a paragraph from that report, because surely it clearly and properly represents the law as we understand it. In discussing that bill and the suspension of remedies, he says:

The committee, however, does not find it necessary to rely upon the language of the court above cited as to the application of these amendments to the war power, for, as stated, neither of the clauses by their terms or by their construction, either in letter or in spirit, covers the case of the various measures of relief embodied in this bill.

Finally, the committee beg to remind the Congress that the due-process clause has never been held to deprive the State of the power of protecting the welfare of its citizens, even at the expense of restricting and destroying life, liberty, and property. A hundred instances will readily suggest themselves. And it has been well said:

"If a State may thus, notwithstanding a due-process limitation, interfere with life, liberty, and property for the sake of health, morals, quiet, and the like, it follows, a fortiori, that notwithstanding a due-process restriction the United States may interfere with life, liberty, and property for the sake of protecting the very existence of the Government itself."

If this may be done by the State without impairment of the constitutional prohibition, surely the Federal Congress, in the prosecution of the war, may not only conscript the life of the citizen, but may under the guarded discretion of the judges of the land as proposed in this measure interfere with the property of the individual to the extent that such interference has been countenanced in this act for a purpose directly relating to the conduct of the war and the preservation of the morale and the self-respect and the peace of mind of the citizen soldier whose body has been conscripted and taken from the peaceful walks of business life.

The Federal Constitution provides that no State shall pass any law impairing the obligation of contracts.

There are no such limitations in that behalf upon the power of Congress with respect to our legislative authority over the District. We are not impairing the obligation of contracts by this legislation. We are simply suspending the landlord's reme-

dies. Who is it who wants to take the position that at the very moment when we see these people about to be put on the streets we can not suspend the right to sue out a writ of ejectment?

We say by this resolution, in substance, if these people shall continue to pay the rent that by contract they have been paying heretofore during the period of the war, and comply with the terms of the lease, they shall not be dispossessed.

I do not expect this legislation to be permanent. I, for one, would not have consented to it if I had thought it was to be permanent; but while it may operate in certain instances as an injustice upon a few people, I am confident that it is going to do vastly more good to a vastly larger number of people than it will injure, and I do not believe it will do very serious injury to any of them.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KIRBY in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. POMERENE. I do.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I did not clearly understand the Senator's reference to the powers of Congress, in its legislation over the District of Columbia, as distinguished from those of the States. Do I understand the Senator to claim that Congress is not subject to the constitutional provisions in legislating for the District of Columbia?

Mr. POMERENE. I am afraid the Senator did not hear the earlier part of my statement.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I heard both parts, but I did not understand either.

Mr. POMERENE. I am very sorry. I am sure it was my fault if I did not make myself clear.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. No; I think very likely it was the fault of neither of us; but I thought the Senator might be able to clear up that matter in my mind.

Mr. POMERENE. I said that our power was complete, save and except as it was limited by the provisions of the Constitution.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Then it is no more complete than the powers of anybody that is limited by the provisions of the Constitution.

Mr. POMERENE. Oh, yes, it is; because there is a limitation placed upon the right of the States to interfere with the right of contract. That is an inhibition against the power of the States to interfere with the right of contract, and that was what I was trying to make clear when I read from the report of Judge Webb.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Does the Senator think that Congress can impair the obligation of a contract?

Mr. POMERENE. Why, we have been doing it incidentally right along when we passed certain prohibition laws and other laws affecting the health, morals, and comfort of the people. There have been a good many instances of it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not doubt that Congress has passed many an unconstitutional act. Some of them have not been tested and so declared; but does the Senator think that Congress can constitutionally pass a law impairing the obligation of a contract?

Mr. POMERENE. As a general proposition, perhaps it ought not to; but because it incidentally interferes with the power of contract it will not thereby vitiate legislation, in my judgment.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not understand the distinction between doing it and incidentally doing it.

Mr. POMERENE. Perhaps I have not been able to make myself as clear as I should, but that is my view of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. FRANCE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Brandegee	Gulon	Overman	Smith, Ariz.
Chamberlain	Harding	Page	Smith, Ga.
Culberson	Johnson, Cal.	Phelan	Smith, Md.
Cummins	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pittman	Smith, Mich.
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Polindexter	Smoot
Dillingham	Kellogg	Pomerene	Sutherland
Fall	Kenyon	Ransdell	Thomas
Fernald	Kirby	Reed	Trammell
Fletcher	Lewis	Saulsbury	Vardaman
France	McNary	Shafroth	Wadsworth
Frelinghuysen	Myers	Sheppard	Warren
Gallinger	Norris	Shields	Wiley

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. Goff] by reason of illness.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I desire to announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHurst], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr.

GRONNA], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. NUGENT] are absent on important business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Only 48 Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of the absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SMITH of South Carolina, and Mr. TOWNSEND answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, now that the usual farce has been enacted of Senators being called into one door to leave immediately, either through the same door or some other door, I am going to occupy two or three minutes in some observations on this conference report.

First, I want to say that had I been present unanimous consent would not have been given for consideration of the conference report to-day, because this report, like all other conference reports, ought to be first printed, and Senators be given an opportunity to compare it with the bills that have passed both Houses and to examine in detail its provisions. That has been denied us. I do not know what is in the report, nor does any other Senator, except those who have had it in their charge.

I had read from the desk a little while ago a letter from a gentleman in charge of a large office building in this city—the Atlantic Building. Three years ago the Forest Service occupied a portion of that building. There were thousands of signs "To let" on the houses of Washington. There were great office buildings entirely vacant, without a single tenant in them. I have in mind now two such office buildings. The owners of the Atlantic Building—some of them people dependent almost entirely upon their dividends for their support—were renting it at a fair rental, not an exorbitant rental for the money that was invested in it, but at a fair rental. The Forest Service, seeing its opportunity, asked that that rental should be very largely reduced, notifying the proprietors that unless it was reduced they would move out. I was appealed to and asked to talk with some of the gentlemen connected with the Forest Service about this matter, a friend of mine being interested in the building, which I did; but they frankly said, "We can get a lower rental elsewhere, and unless the rental is reduced we will move out."

Under those circumstances, in the stress that was upon them, the proprietors of the building reduced the rental to a very large extent, so that since that time they have been getting practically 1 per cent on the money invested in that building. They are now renting it at 51 cents per square foot floor space. It will be remembered that not long ago, when attention was called to the great office building that is being erected on Vermont Avenue, and which the Government has taken over at a price of \$4,300,000, the statement was made here that the price paid was not exorbitant because it was not much in excess, if in excess at all, of \$1 per square foot; and yet the building to which I allude, the Atlantic Building, is being let at 51 cents per square foot, and, as I observe, the owners are getting 1 per cent by way of dividends. Now, it is proposed that that rental shall be continued during the balance of the war, unless, perchance, the Secretary of Agriculture concludes to allow a larger rental, which the Secretary of Agriculture may possibly do; but I doubt very much whether he will do it, or, if he does do it, whether an adequate rental will be allowed.

Mr. President, that is one case, but there are others in the city that are similarly situated as that building, and, as I observed a few minutes ago, while this measure may work to the advantage of some people, it will work to the great disadvantage of many other people in the District of Columbia. I feel sure that if the matter were given further consideration some more equitable measure could be evolved that would not do the injustice that this one certainly will do if it becomes a law.

I confess that I have not as definite knowledge of the measure as I ought to have. As I remarked a little while ago, we have all been busy, and I have been particularly busy in the Committee on Appropriations. I am going to ask the Senator from Delaware if this joint resolution particularly applies to people in the service of the Government, as was stated by some Senator? In other words, if I own a house in the city of Washington and desire to change my tenant, even to allow a man or woman in the service of the Government to occupy it, am I at liberty to do that?

Mr. SAULSBURY. If the Senator is occupying the building himself and desires to rent it to some one—is that the question?

Mr. GALLINGER. No; I may not myself be occupying it, but the building is rented and I desire to change my tenant. Can I do so?

Mr. SAULSBURY. Under the joint resolution, if the tenant desired to stay there at the same rent, the Senator could not do it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Now, let me carry that a little further. I know a man who owns a building in the city of Washington which is rented. Since this joint resolution was introduced, or about that time, the occupant was notified to vacate the premises—of course, at the expiration of 30 days, and I believe an additional 7 days is allowed in the District of Columbia—and the owner of the building desired to have it vacated for the purpose of letting a man in the employ of the Government occupy it for 20 per cent less rent than he is getting at the present time; but he can not do that under this proposed law, can he?

Mr. SAULSBURY. The tenants can not be changed if they continue to pay their rent.

Mr. GALLINGER. Exactly; and I want to make this specific. I chance to own that building. I want it vacated to allow a man in the employment of the Government to occupy it at 20 per cent less than I am getting at the present moment, but it seems this legislation will not allow me to do it. That being so, we ought to stop talking of European autocracy.

Mr. SAULSBURY. There are doubtless a number of cases of which the Senator from New Hampshire and various other Senators know where some injustice, or what seems to be some unfairness, will be worked; but, on the other hand, we are familiar with the fact that there are hundreds and thousands of cases where, as shown by the letter of the Acting Secretary of the Navy, his force is being disorganized by the panic which has been produced by this rent profiteering; and, as we hear from clergymen, they are being begged to pray that the hard hearts of the rent profiteers in this District may be made more tender. Now, I am not exaggerating. I am informed that it is actually the case that in some cases clergymen have been asked to pray that the flinty hearts of the rent profiteers may be made more tender.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have no doubt that that request has been made by somebody; but I have been unable to discover from my investigations that this wholesale accusation that is made against the owners of property in the District of Columbia is well founded. As I said the other day, I chance to occupy a very modest apartment in one of the largest apartment houses in Washington, and Senators around me occupy apartments in other great apartment houses in Washington, but we have not been notified that we are going to be dispossessed unless we pay more rent. My observation is that the most of this complaint comes from some small apartment houses, and that a large amount of the grievances is due to the fact that the parties occupying those apartments are subletting them at an enormous increase in rental.

Mr. President, there are grievances, no doubt; but, in my judgment, the harm that is going to come so completely outweighs the benefits that are going to accrue that I feel constrained to vote against the conference report. I think this matter could be worked out on a much more equitable system, and that the outrages that will necessarily result from this legislation could be avoided. I do not believe, Mr. President, that the owners of the Atlantic Building, who are getting 51 cents a square foot in rental, having been forced three years ago from the circumstance that there were so many vacant buildings in the city of Washington to reduce their rent, ought to be compelled by legislation of Congress to continue the same rental, netting them about 1 per cent on their investment; and yet that is exactly what this bill does.

As I said a few days ago, I have no disposition to delay the consideration of this conference report, notwithstanding the injustices its passage will work. The conference report ought to have been printed. It ought to have been on the desk of every Senator. We ought to have had an opportunity to examine it. That has been denied us, however, and so all I can do is to enter my protest against it and cast my vote against it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I desire very briefly to express my opposition to the acceptance of this conference report, and to state that I feel constrained to vote against it, not that I do not want some proper measure taken to prevent profiteering in the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, in my opinion this joint resolution is defective in so many respects that I am driven to the conclusion that it will do more harm than good. I agree entirely with the views expressed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]. I think the joint resolution is absolutely unconstitutional, and will be so declared. Of course its constitutionality will be tested by the first party who is aggrieved by its operations.

A short time ago I was called out by a lawyer here in the city, who told me that he represents two estates here in Washington which at present are leasing two large tracts of vacant land.



It was necessary for the estate to borrow the sum of \$10,000. The two vacant tracts of land were leased. The manager of the estate made arrangements with a Baltimore concern for the loan of \$10,000 on those two tracts of land. Within a day or two the manager of the estate was visited by the party who had agreed to make the loan and told that he would have to withdraw his proposition to make the loan on that property; that if the land was to be continued to be rented at the same price that it was then during the whole war, which was an indefinite period, he could not loan any money for the parties he represented upon any such uncertain state of facts as that. It simply shows how the measure cuts one way as to all estates that are being handled for the benefit of widows and orphans and benevolent purposes.

I do not think there is any demand that business property in the District of Columbia should be subject to the provisions of this joint resolution. As I understand the grievance here in Washington, it is 100,000 new people having been dumped on this city in the last year, since we declared war, that they want bedrooms and beds; they want shelter, so that they can get off the streets. But merchants' stores, Mr. President, are rented in the part of the country that I come from—and I assume it is true here—for periods of 3, 5, or 10 years. No merchant will rent a store and put his fixtures in it and transfer the good will of his business to that location unless he has a lease sufficiently long to warrant him in making the expenditure and taking the risk.

Now, look at it. Here is a store which was rented 10 years ago, when Washington probably had a population of 200,000 less than are here to-day, considering the increased population that has been put upon this city since the war was declared. Ten years ago the rental of that store was fixed at what now seems a ridiculously small figure; yet under the operation of this joint resolution that lease is to be continued at the rent fixed 10 years ago, when the property was not worth one-quarter of what it is worth to-day, and it is to be so continued for an indefinite period, although the owner of the property may have mortgaged the property based upon the contract that he has made with the lessee that he was to recover possession to-day, and then was to sell the property and take up his mortgage and pay his debt. The owner may be under another existing contract to-day that upon the termination of this contract he will rent the property to somebody else, and yet this joint resolution steps in and absolutely declares nugatory that second contract and forces upon the landlord a contract which has terminated by its own terms and by the free act of the parties, and compels that contract, now expired, to continue in force for an indefinite period—during the war.

The joint resolution bristles with situations that can not be foreseen, but we may see enough of them now to know that it is exceedingly dangerous to vote for the measure. The only answer that is made to these criticisms, all of which are just and unanswerable, is that we are at war, and that Congress can do anything it wants when we are at war; that the due-process-of-law clause does not any longer exist; that we can confiscate for private parties, not for public purposes; that we can order what a landlord shall say to one tenant as against another, one bidder in the open market as against another, not for governmental purposes, not to win the war, but to interfere with the arrangement in the business community between the landlord and the tenant. There is no grievance whatever about the relation between the landlord and tenant in his property. The whole question is one of housing and lodging, and not how much a man who rents a store on F Street or Pennsylvania Avenue shall pay the landlord.

We are told we ought to vote for this measure because later on we are promised the distinguished chairman of the conference committee, the Senator from Delaware, will do his best to see that the Pomerene bill can get through both branches of Congress.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator that in view of the fact that the rental value of business property rises and falls with the comparative prosperity or lack of prosperity of the business which is conducted in that property, this measure works a tremendous advantage to the storekeeper, we will say, who rented his property five or six years ago and who to-day is running an infinitely more prosperous business than he did when he originally rented the property.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That is quite true.

Mr. WADSWORTH. As a matter of common justice, a division of the burdens or profits, whichever we may term the rental of office or business property, may be at least allowed according to the prosperity of the business that is going to be conducted in it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It seems to me so. As I said before, every merchant here who based his rent on what his business

could afford to pay on a population of customers of 360,000, if it was so a year ago, and now there are 450,000 people, many of them the richest people of the country, who come here as his customers, may be making twice in profits what he made before and what he thought he could pay for his rent when he made the lease.

Furthermore, Mr. President, except in a very small percentage of cases, this only binds one party to the contract. It takes hold of the lessor, the landlord, and compels him to allow the tenant to stay in, but does it compel the tenant to stay in? No.

Suppose the value of the property has diminished, as it has in certain sections of the city, and suppose the landlord would like to have the tenant continue at the old rate, does this treat both parties to the contract the same? No; it is a jug-handled arrangement. It says that the tenant shall always have the advantage; that the landlord shall have nothing to say about it; that Congress will regulate the terms of the contract which the landlord makes, and the tenant can do as he pleases. The tenant is left free to abandon his contract when it is perfected. The landlord is compelled by the United States Government to continue the contract willy-nilly beyond the terms of his contract, to perform a contract that the United States Government is going to make him keep, and to perform it for an indefinite period, whether it results in foreclosure or ruin to him or to a trust company or to the estates of all the people who have their money in the fiduciary and mercantile and banking and investment companies of this country.

I am not attacking this proposition; I think some relief ought to be devised; but I say, simply because times are trying and people are excited and their emotions are deeply stirred, every time we see a grievance we must not cast down the limitations and provisions of the Constitution and rush into confiscation and anarchy and chaos. Mr. President, that will not tend to inspire confidence in this country or in its financial institutions, nor in the integrity and good judgment of its legislators, who are a part of the Government itself.

I do think, in view of what has been said about this measure, that no serious error will be committed and no serious damage will be done if this conference report should be rejected and the conferees and the committees of the two branches of Congress be given a few days more to see if something more equitable can not be worked out.

Mr. REED. Before the Senator takes his seat—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED. Touching the question of what is a fair rent to charge, I desire to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that I am informed the Director General of Railroads has issued an order raising freight rates all over the United States 25 per cent and raising passenger rates to 3 cents a mile, and in some instances to 3½ cents, a raise that in some places would be equivalent to 33½ per cent. I assume if this has been done it is upon the basis that values change, and wages are necessarily higher all along the line. If that is the situation, then surely it is a fact that ought to be considered in the making of an equitable adjustment of rent fixing in this District. The joint resolution seems to utterly ignore it. I wanted to call the Senator's attention to that fact.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I think the Senator's remark is very germane. I see in the papers that the Director General has raised salaries and wages upon the railroads of the country to an amount which would total \$300,000,000, if I have the figure correctly, and has made it retroactive, so that it goes back into the past. Of course, the Senator is entirely correct that the whole system of values, of wages, cost of living, and cost of products and materials has wavered and changed all over the country; it has surged up and gone back and surged up again.

Mr. REED. Let me call the Senator's attention to another matter.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Very well.

Mr. REED. Interest rates have enormously advanced. Let us assume the case of a man who built a structure in Washington and who fixed the rent so as to give him a fair return upon the cost of that building, and a part of the cost of the building—50 per cent of it—is represented by a trust deed that bears 4½ per cent interest. That trust deed is now maturing, and it can only be renewed at 7 per cent interest. What will be the effect of a measure of this kind under such circumstances?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I am at a loss to describe the kind of embarrassment the man would be in. Money is now worth in the neighborhood of 7 per cent in the market, where it was 4 and 4½ per cent before. If he could not renew it at 4½ per cent he would have to renew it on the best terms he could get. It means that his expense is doubled, yet the rent is held by an act of Congress, his return from his property is held where it was when he could borrow money at 4 or 4½ per cent.

Mr. REED. Let me ask the Senator another question: Suppose a man was going away and knew he would be absent from the city for a period of four or five months and he wanted to have his property in extra good hands. Therefore, he rented it at a very low rental, possibly a nominal rental. Now, desiring to resume possession of it for the purpose of handling his property as his own, he finds himself confronted by a law which provides that the nominal rent shall continue indefinitely.

I want to ask the Senator now a question connected with that. Does he believe such a law as that can stand the test of the court?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. No; I do not. I stated so. I gave the Senator an instance on Saturday. I had read into the RECORD a letter written to me by a gentleman who is a large real-estate owner in this city, one of the leading men of the District of Columbia, giving the experience of his brother, who had erected an apartment house here within a year which contains 18 apartments. He rented those apartments at about \$200 a month, which was a very modest rent. Eleven out of those 18 tenants have let those apartments at three times what they paid the landlord for them, and the landlord had to take the curse of it and be called a profiteer. Apartments which had been rented for \$200 a month were sublet before the tenants had moved into them at \$650. It is in large measure the tenants themselves who have created this distress and this profiteering, and not the landlords. Many a building here in Washington had been almost vacant for some years. As the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], who knows the District as well as any other Senator, at least who was chairman of the District Committee for a number of years, said a few years ago pretty much one house out of every four had a sign "To let" upon it, and I doubt if real estate in this city, houses and tenants, netted the owners 3 per cent on the property in the last 10 years on an average.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. The signs were so numerous on the houses that at the instance of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] we legislated to prevent more than a certain number of signs to be placed on any given piece of property.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And of a certain size.

Mr. GALLINGER. And of a certain size.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I put another letter in the RECORD on Saturday from a gentleman, a real-estate man, who stated that he knew of a building in a business block here that cost the owner \$100,000, and after holding it vacant for several years and paying the taxes and interest out of his own pocket and losing the rent he had finally rented it for \$100 a month, the whole business building, in order that he might get \$1,200 a year to help pay the taxes on it. He is now offered \$7,000 a year for the building, which would be 7 per cent, and taking out 2 per cent for taxes and insurance would leave him a net of 5 per cent, irrespective of depreciation and repairs; and now he is to be compelled during the indefinite period of this war to continue the rent of the building for \$1,200 a year, for which he was offered \$7,000 for a legitimate purpose, a purpose that will not hinder the winning of the war at all, and he is compelled to let his tenant make the difference between \$1,200 and \$7,000. His tenant can turn around and rent it for \$10,000 if he wants to. Under the joint resolution every tenant who early enough foresaw what was liable to happen and rented apartments and buildings at a cheap rent and then sublet them at four and five times what he paid for them is protected. The joint resolution ought to be entitled "A joint resolution to protect the profiteers in the collection of their extortionate profits," for it guarantees and gives immunity to every tenant profiteer who has deliberately raised rents from three to four times what they ought to be without the expenditure of a dollar on his part.

Mr. President, as I have said, I am unable to vote for the conference report at this time. I think it can be bettered.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, no man can gainsay the serious nature of the objections urged this morning against favorable consideration of this measure. That it will operate unjustly and unfairly in some directions is inevitable. Any bill which has for its purpose the regulation of prices must inevitably react somewhere, and sometimes the consequences of the reaction may be more serious than the benefit derived from the measure.

But I am not impressed with the contention that because of these things the conference report should be rejected. Fundamentally the joint resolution, if it shall operate inequitably, will be a powerful stimulus to the early framing and enactment of a measure that will be reasonably equitable, all things considered, and without something of this kind whereby conditions are

kept in status quo pending final action we may or may not be able to reach a legislative solution of a very serious and overpowering situation in this District.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator think that this measure will furnish some relief against bad conditions?

Mr. THOMAS. If I did not think so, I would not support it.

Mr. REED. If it will furnish some relief against bad conditions, it will make conditions better than they are. Then how will it afford a stimulus to other legislation?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think inasmuch as the joint resolution while affording some relief will also produce some of the consequences which the Senator from Missouri and others predict, the interests which are thus affected will, instead of trying to prevent any legislation, as they are now doing, join with those of us who want to cure these difficulties in a legislative way, and iron them out in such manner as will produce the least possible discomfort and loss. Of course, that may or may not result from the enactment of the measure, but I am inclined to think that it will aid us in an early legislative solution of what may be called the District problem.

Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri directed the attention of the Senator from Connecticut a moment ago to the recent raise in freight rates upon the lines of transportation of the country. We also read in the morning press that the wages of the men have been increased. If it were possible to reach this situation by freight and wage raises there might be no necessity for the enactment of this or any measure, because I have noticed with some disappointment that every application for a raise of wages and salaries which comes to the Congress finds favorable consideration. But, Mr. President, the misfortune, if it is one, in times like these is that every raise in fixed compensation is attended by a corresponding raise in everything that is essential to existence.

I have iterated and reiterated this proposition so frequently during this session of Congress that I am afraid by this time its further repetition will be more of an infliction than an enlightenment of the Senate. The increase in the prices of all the necessities of life, generally speaking, is more rapid and larger in volume than the increase in wages and salaries, and as a consequence, if that practice is continued, in order to do away with an existing evil of serious proportions it will merely result in a race between employees whose salaries are increased and the material men who furnish him the necessities of life, sustenance, clothing, and so forth. So as matter of fact that sort of panacea gets us nowhere.

Mr. President, there is much in the contention of the Senator from Missouri regarding the constitutional features of this measure considered in its larger aspects, but subject of course to those fundamental conditions and principles which safeguard property and the rights of the citizen, the power of Congress over this District is absolute. My contention is that the constitutional basis of this legislation is found in that clause of the Constitution which gives to the Congress exclusive jurisdiction over the District. This District was created for the one purpose, and for the one purpose only, that it might be for all time the seat of government of the Republic. Provision was made by the fathers in the framing of the Constitution for just such a place, and as a matter of course the jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States, representing the legislative authority, attached to and became absolute over that particular spot, wherever it might be located. Its territorial dimensions have up to this time been greater than the pressure of governmental activities upon it, but even in times of peace those activities were constantly increasing.

The Government at every session of Congress extends the boundaries of its jurisdiction and takes in some particular sphere or element which up to that time was by negation, at least, supposed to be beyond its constitutional power and authority. The result has been a multiplication of bureaus and of commissions ad nauseam.

We have long ago become a bureaucracy, a condition that is inevitable, Mr. President, when Government activities are unduly extended. So at the time war was declared against Germany the activities of the Government had so multiplied and had so extended that the pressure upon the territory of the District was already noticeable. With the war that pressure became enormous and the smaller expansions in times of peace were infinitesimal as compared with the sudden influx into the District of Columbia of vast hordes of new employees, whose presence and whose labor are essential to the proper transaction of governmental business. They must be here. They have no choice about it until the Government shall, as I think it should during the period of the war, transfer some of these



bureaus and commissions to other cities of the Union. Indeed that, to my mind, is the best solution of the problem of human congestion in this District. There is no reason in the world why the Fuel Commission and the Food Commission should not be in St. Louis and in Chicago, respectively. There is no reason in the world why the various bureaus of the Land Department should not be located during the period of the war somewhere in the territory of the public-domain States, where their work belongs and over which their jurisdiction extends. But there is only one authority which can do that, and that is the President of the United States under the provisions of the Overman Act. It is not likely that that kind of relief will come very soon.

Now, what confronts us in this District? There are probably 150,000 to 200,000 human beings here who were not needed here on the 6th day of April, 1917, when war was declared, but who are indispensable now. If one wants to obtain a fair notion of the expanse of activities of the Government since that time, all he has to do is to take an automobile and ride through the Mall, the business portion of the city, and the residence portion immediately adjoining the business portion. Apart from the vast ranges of barracks that have been constructed, temporary in their character yet crowded to overflowing, the fact is that many of our business buildings, a great many of our apartment houses, and other structures of unusual dimensions have been taken over by the Government and are occupied for public uses. A great many of the employees of the Government have their families here because they can not live anywhere else. They are constantly crowding, crowding, crowding beyond the capacity of the District to house them. That presents a problem of the first magnitude. It presents conditions which can only be reached by summary legislation. Any measure designed to secure shelter and a livelihood at reasonable rates for these men and women in the employ of the Government at this time is necessarily and essentially for a public purpose. Any bill designed to take property, real estate, and structures necessarily required by this situation is legislation for a public purpose, and the taking over of such property is the taking of it for a public use.

Mr. President, under our Constitution in time of war the Government may billet its soldiers in private residences and compel private families to maintain them. That can not be done in times of peace. It is just as much a public purpose to legislate for the purpose of securing shelter for the large army of civil employees as it would be to billet soldiers among private families in time of war if conditions warranted the practice.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. REED. I wish to ask the Senator a question, because I have great respect for his opinion as a lawyer. Is a bill which proposes to allow any tenant whatsoever, connected with the Government or disconnected with the Government, to occupy a piece of property the same thing as the Government taking a piece of property into which it proposes to put its soldiers?

Mr. THOMAS. No.

Mr. REED. Then the parallel that the Senator appeals to does not exist.

Mr. THOMAS. I may have been unfortunate in my expression of the parallel. The parallel which I attempted to draw was that between billeting the soldiers in time of war and the taking of private property for the housing of civil employees of the Government.

Mr. REED. But I call the Senator's attention to the fact that this joint resolution does not propose to take property for the housing of civil employees of the Government. It proposes to let A B, whether he is a citizen even of the United States or not, continue to occupy a piece of property. For instance, it protects the Chinese laundry just as effectively as it does an officer of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS. It does prevent the institution of any change in the rate of rent in any existing contract, because that is essential to the protection of a large body of the employees of the Government now occupying quarters and whose rent may and probably will be enhanced unless they are protected by the Government. In doing that the joint resolution draws no distinction between the tenant who is an employee of the Government and the tenant who is not. I believe if it did draw such a distinction it might then be subject to a very serious objection as being class legislation.

Mr. REED. But, Mr. President, there is no such thing as class legislation applied to the District of Columbia. That is a limitation—

Mr. THOMAS. There is not, but there might be.

Mr. REED. No; there is not in the Constitution any such limitation. This is what I want to get at. I agree with the

Senator that we being at war the Government has the right to commandeer and take over such property as is necessary to the progress of the war. But the Government in that case takes it over in its own name, does it not, and it must make just compensation?

Mr. THOMAS. That is true.

Mr. REED. This joint resolution does not take over the property in the name of the Government, but lets it remain in the hands of a private citizen who happens to have been a tenant.

Mr. THOMAS. That is true, Mr. President; the effect and operation of the joint resolution are local in that part of the country which bears the impress of war—the seat of government—and over which the Congress possesses exclusive jurisdiction.

Mr. REED. It does possess exclusive jurisdiction, but its only jurisdiction is such as it gets from the Constitution.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, yes; the Constitution is the measure and the limit of it.

Mr. REED. Now, let us assume that the Government being at war desired to quarter its soldiers on the premises of an individual, would not the Government in that event be taking that property for the time being, and would it not have to make just compensation?

Mr. THOMAS. It would be subjecting it, of course, to use for a public purpose, and it would be required to make compensation. But the owner is not dispossessed. He is burdened with an unusual situation.

Mr. REED. Does not this joint resolution propose to take the property of A and to transfer it to B, a private citizen, who may or may not have any connection with the Government?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, it operates upon those who are and those who are not employees of the Government; but in doing that I do not think it is subject to the charge of taking property without compensation, except in the sense that the compensation now enjoyed can not be increased during the war.

Mr. REED. Well, is it not taking property when you take away from the owner of the property the right to sell it or the right to lease it in accordance with the laws and customs of the land?

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, it interferes with the rights of property, Mr. President; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. REED. Which is a property right.

Mr. THOMAS. But inasmuch as the greater includes the less, and inasmuch as in this District the sovereign problem of housing and overcrowding is right before us, we can not expect in a short time to frame and pass a joint resolution that will not do injustice somewhere. We are confronting an emergency.

Mr. REED. But, Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me one more interrogatory—

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. REED. Are we justified in undertaking to disregard or in disregarding the Constitution of the United States and property rights merely because we have not time to draw a law?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I do not think we are justified in violating the Constitution, except in a crisis where the very existence of the Republic is imperiled, and the violation of part is necessary to save the balance of it; but the difference between myself and the Senator from Missouri is aimed directly at that proposition. In the District of Columbia, and because of the war conditions and the needs of the Government, I do not think that the Constitution is violated by this joint resolution, except in the modified sense that by these temporary interferences with the property of the landlord some of his rights are suspended, so to speak, until legislation of a more desirable character can be substituted for it.

Mr. REED. But, Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado is too good a lawyer to contend that the mere length of time you interfere with a man's constitutional rights is a thing that determines its constitutionality?

Mr. THOMAS. That is true, Mr. President.

Mr. REED. Of course, the Senator from Colorado does not think that the existence of the Nation is at stake in this joint resolution?

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, no; I think I can say with the Senator from Missouri, for whose legal ability I have the most profound respect—indeed, I regard the Senator as one of the ablest lawyers in the United States, a reputation which he has justly acquired by long service at the bar and upon this floor—if this measure were one that extended in its territorial operation beyond the seat of government, I think his contention would be absolutely unanswerable.

Mr. REED. Now, let me, then, get the Senator's view on that. Of course, we will not disagree about the facts at all, that all of those rights which are reserved to the States, and which therefore are taken away from the jurisdiction of the Federal

Government when we come to legislate with reference to matters within the States, do not exist in the District of Columbia and do not limit the Federal Government's rights here. In other words, the Federal Government in the District of Columbia is a complete sovereign?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. REED. And yet the Senator will agree with me that the rights of the Federal Government—that is, of Congress and of the President—are subject to the general limitations of the Constitution; that is to say, a man living even in the District of Columbia has certain rights under the Constitution and to the protection of the law of the land?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. REED. One of those rights is that he shall not be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. That right exists even in the District of Columbia, does it not?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. REED. Well, if it does exist in the District of Columbia, and Congress proceeds to say to a man who happened to rent a piece of property for \$10 a month last year, although the fair market value of it even last year was \$100 a month, "Because you rented it last year at \$10 to A. B. for a period of a year, you shall therefore be obliged to allow this man to live in your property during the next three years that this war may exist at the same rental," does that not deprive him of his property without due process of law?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, Mr. President, in a sense it does, and in a sense it does not. It prevents him from exercising the right which exists in time of peace and independently of an emergency like this of increasing his rent or refusing to rent his property at all; but, on the other hand, it preserves the status quo for the purpose of preventing further profiteering, which must necessarily result in great hardship and injury to the army of employees here upon whom the Government must rely if its business is to be properly transacted.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Colorado does not offer the latter part of that as a constitutional argument?

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, no; it is not a constitutional argument, but I think it is a condition which justifies legislation of this kind; otherwise it might be regarded as class legislation.

Mr. REED. I am thanking the Senator for very patiently permitting this interruption.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator's questions are always illuminating.

Mr. REED. And I am asking these questions in an appeal to the Senator: Is not the proper thing for us to do to follow the suggestion of the President this morning in his address—and which I do not claim was made especially with reference to this matter—that the profiteer can be reached through taxation; and, instead of passing a law here which is patently in the teeth of the Constitution, to pass a law that will so tax excessive rentals as to make it unprofitable for anyone to exact them? What is there about that that is impossible? Why can not that be done?

Mr. THOMAS. That is a most excellent suggestion, and I hope it will be accepted; but the difficulty is that conditions here are such that infinite suffering has been caused and is likely to be continued by changes in rental values reaching a point where the employees can not obtain shelter and have anything left upon which to live before we can enact legislation by means of which we can reach the profiteers' gains through the process of a revenue bill.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. Why can not such a bill be passed in three days' time, if Congress wants to do it?

Mr. THOMAS. We could pass it within three days' time if Congress wanted to do it, but the Senator from Missouri knows no such measure will pass this body within such a period of time.

Mr. REED. Suppose it took three weeks?

Mr. THOMAS. We could not do it in that time.

Mr. REED. I think we could.

Mr. THOMAS. I hope the Senator's opinion will be verified by events.

Mr. REED. If we took three weeks, and then placed a very heavy tax, and this heavy tax began to fall upon the profiteer so that it would no longer be profitable to him to profiteer—

Mr. THOMAS. I might say then, Mr. President—

Mr. REED. We would reach the case of a lease that had already been made. If it had been made at an excessive and brutal profit, it would be reached.

Mr. THOMAS. When we do that we force the landlord to continue the high rentals in order that—

Mr. REED. Oh, no.

Mr. THOMAS. In order that he may meet the enormous tax thus placed upon his war profits.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, so that it will not be left in that shape, my proposition is that when a reasonable limit has been reached the Government shall take all the excess.

Mr. THOMAS. Is not that an interference with property rights?

Mr. REED. Not at all; that is the exercise of the right of taxation; and, as was well said by a justice of the Supreme Court, the right of taxation is the right of confiscation. We have almost gone to that point in reference to some of the excess-profits taxes which we have already passed, and I am ready to go further, and I think this Congress will go further, if we follow the President.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, may I inject a word?

Mr. THOMAS. Just a moment. We must not forget in the consideration of that feature of this question that the money which the Government takes through its lawful powers of excessive taxation will continue to come from the people whom we are trying to protect by this bill; and, while that would benefit the Government, I am afraid that the process would continue, and the men and women whom we would benefit and ought to benefit would obtain no relief whatever.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, the Senator, with his alert mind, has anticipated the question I was going to ask him. How would it benefit the tenants of the District who are being profiteered this year and now by taking from the bank account of the profiteer next year the money they had paid him?

Mr. THOMAS. I am afraid that it would not.

Mr. REED. I do not want to leave that in doubt. Unquestionably the right of Congress to levy this tax and make it apply now exists.

Mr. THOMAS. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. REED. And Congress can make the tax date back if they so desire.

Mr. THOMAS. There is no doubt about that, either.

Mr. REED. There is no doubt about that, so that the suggestion of the Senator from Delaware does not cover the question.

Mr. THOMAS. I think that the suggestion of the Senator from Delaware was not only apt but well-nigh conclusive; and when I take into consideration the fact that prompt and summary legislation is practically an impossible thing in the Congress of the United States, I find sufficient to satisfy me that we should enact this joint resolution and then proceed with permanent legislation upon the subject.

Mr. REED. Let me say, before the Senator takes his seat, that a moment ago the argument was that this was a temporary measure, and it was said that we were speedily to follow it up by permanent legislation.

Mr. THOMAS. That was not my argument.

Mr. REED. No; it was not the Senator's argument; but it is the argument that has been made by the proponents of this measure.

Mr. THOMAS. What I said was that I thought this would expedite a permanent measure on the subject.

Mr. REED. Now, the ground seems to be shifted, and the position is taken that no other bill may be passed except this bill.

Mr. THOMAS. If I left that impression upon the Senator's mind, I am very glad he did not permit me to take my seat, as I intended to do. My criticism of our legislative processes was not confined to any particular measure. It was provoked by the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri that we could, if we would, speedily enact revenue legislation that would meet this difficulty. I say generally, independently of the bill that I hope will be brought in here and enacted regarding this particular subject, that it is difficult to secure speedy legislation upon any subject, and that that fact, together with the suggestions which I have attempted to offer upon this joint resolution, justify me, at least, in the position which I will take upon the joint resolution when we reach a final vote.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, if I may ask the Senator a question before he takes his seat, he bases his position on the joint resolution, as I understand, largely on the ground of the necessity for taking care of people who are engaged in some relation to the activities of the Government?

Mr. THOMAS. And on our legislative power over the District.

Mr. FLETCHER. And on our legislative power over the District. Does not the Senator feel that to come within those rules the joint resolution ought to be limited in its application to persons engaged in the work of or employed by the Government?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not, for the reason that it might afford a loophole through which the very people against whom we are attempting here to legislate might escape.



Mr. FLETCHER. I can not see how that could be done, because it is easy enough to obtain the pay roll and list of employees of the Government.

Mr. THOMAS. It may not be possible to do so, but we should take no chances.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, turning to the law which is now on the statute books, entitled "An act to authorize the President to provide housing for war needs," this proviso will be found:

*Provided, That \$10,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of the amount hereby authorized shall be used only to build or acquire, as herein provided, housing accommodations within the District of Columbia for such Government employees as can not be housed as advantageously in other cities in the service of the Government.*

We have voted \$10,000,000 to build houses or to acquire houses for Government employees. I do not know whether or not the work has been started. If it has not been, certainly it ought to be started immediately. Ten million dollars would build 2,000 \$5,000 houses in the District of Columbia, and 2,000 houses would go a long way toward solving the problem that is troubling the proponents of this joint resolution. Indeed, there is no reason why each house should cost \$5,000, if built by the Government; and, to my mind, that relief ought to be available in the near future.

I am going to say one word more. I find in the evening paper just printed this headline, "Passenger rates 3 cents a mile; freight also up." Mr. President, we have been traveling in New England for 2½ cents a mile; but the exigencies of the case, the peculiar situation, lead the Director of the Railroads to boost passenger fares to 3 cents a mile, as against 2½ cents. Another headline reads, "Freight charges will be up 25 per cent." This is an acknowledgment of the fact that everything is on the upward trend; that we have got to be more liberal than was necessary under different conditions; and to say that men who own property in the District of Columbia shall not, because of existing conditions, be permitted to charge any more than they were charging a year ago or thereabouts, is, to my mind, an utter denial of their rights. We ought not to enact any such proposition into law.

Those of us who travel on the railroads and the men who send freight over the railroads of the country do not like the idea of paying more for passenger or freight service than they have been paying heretofore; but conditions are such that the Director General, under the direction, no doubt, of the President of the United States, has seen fit to make this 25 per cent increase. I believe in passenger rates it is more than a 25 per cent increase in many parts of our country.

So, Mr. President, it does seem to me that we ought to pause in this proposed legislation; that we ought to wait a little while, and that we ought to give the Government time to commence the erection of houses, for which \$10,000,000 has been appropriated, to meet the emergency that exists so far as the employees of the Government are concerned. But I presume it has been ordained otherwise; and so all I can do is to enter, as I did a few moments ago, my protest against this legislation and cast my vote against the adoption of the conference report when the vote is taken.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, I shall only delay the Senate by telling the Senator what a very prominent official of the Government said to me last night, and then I shall hope, after I suggest the absence of a quorum, that we may have a vote.

A very prominent official of the Government, who is now paying between seven and eight thousand dollars a year for his house, said to me yesterday afternoon that within the last week he had been notified that his rent was to be raised to \$10,000. When he said that the house was not worth it his landlord replied, "Oh, this is our harvest time."

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and hope that we shall soon have a vote on the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Baird	Harding	Nugent	Smith, Md.
Brandeggee	Hardwick	Overman	Smith, Mich.
Chamberlain	Henderson	Page	Sutherland
Colt	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose	Swanson
Cummings	Jones, N. Mex.	Polindexter	Thomas
Curtis	Kellogg	Reed	Thompson
Dillingham	Kendrick	Saulsbury	Townsend
Fernald	Kenyon	Shafroth	Trammell
Fletcher	Lewis	Sheppard	Vardaman
France	McNary	Sherman	Warren
Gallinger	Martin	Smith, Ariz.	Wildley
Gronna	Myers		
Guion	Norris		

Mr. HENDERSON. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. PITTMAN] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The question is on agreeing to the report of the committee of conference.

Mr. SAULSBURY. On that I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GUION (when his name was called). I wish to announce that I am paired with the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LEXROOT]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] and vote "yea."

Mr. KELLOGG (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. PENROSE (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] and vote "nay."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], who is absent. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SWANSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], who is unavoidably detained from the Senate. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] and vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BRANDEGEE (after having voted in the negative). I am paired for to-day and to-morrow with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN];

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES];

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH];

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT]; and

The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY].

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], which I transfer to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN], who has not voted, to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted as follows:

## YEAS—31.

Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Phelan	Smith, Ga.
Colt	Kendrick	Polindexter	Smith, Md.
Curtis	Kenyon	Pomerene	Swanson
Dillingham	Kirby	Saulsbury	Thomas
Gronna	McNary	Shafroth	Thompson
Guion	Martin	Sheppard	Townsend
Henderson	Myers	Sherman	Trammell
Johnson, S. Dak.	Nugent	Smith, Ariz.	

## NAYS—17.

Baird	France	Penrose	Warren
Brandeggee	Gallinger	Reed	Wildley
Cummings	Harding	Smith, Mich.	
Fernald	Hardwick	Smoot	
Fletcher	Page	Underwood	

## NOT VOTING—48.

Ashurst	Hitchcock	McCumber	Simmons
Bankhead	Hollis	McKellar	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	James	McLean	Sterling
Borah	Johnson, Cal.	Nelson	Sutherland
Calder	Jones, Wash.	New	Tillman
Culberson	Kellogg	Norris	Vardaman
Fall	King	Overman	Wadsworth
Frelinghuysen	Knox	Owen	Walsh
Gerry	La Follette	Pittman	Watson
Goff	Lenroot	Ransdell	Weeks
Gore	Lewis	Robinson	Williams
Hale	Lodge	Shields	Wolcott

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the question of agreeing to the report of the committee of conference, the yeas are 31 and the nays are 17; the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND] being in the

Senate Chamber, paired and not voting, the Chair declares the conference report agreed to.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MARTIN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 28, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, May 27, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We lift up our hearts in gratitude to Thee, our Father in Heaven, for all the disclosures Thou hast made of Thyself, especially for the disclosures in the incomparable life, character, and wonderful precepts which fell from the lips of the Master, which not only teach us the way and the truth and the life—but especially for the comforting and reassuring words:

"Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.

"Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls.

"For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light."

Again:

"Let not your heart be troubled; ye believe in God, believe also in me.

"In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you."

The world is plunged into a terrible war, destructive beyond compare; thousands of hearts are borne down in sorrow and grief; grant that they may be comforted, sustained, and upheld by the precious words of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday was read and approved.

#### DISTRICT BUSINESS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kentucky rise?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Under the rules of the House this is District day. However, the Committee on Pensions has an agreement under which they have precedence to-day; and, next, my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], desires to bring up an appropriation bill. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that when the appropriation bill has been disposed of that the next day thereafter may be given to the consideration of District bills.

The SPEAKER. Now, there are two appropriation bills.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I refer particularly to the urgent deficiency bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] asks unanimous consent that instead of bringing up his District bills to-day, which is District day, that he shall have the right of way immediately after this deficiency appropriation bill is disposed of. Is there objection?

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire if that means, if the gentleman gets unanimous consent that this shall come up, that then if the House should wish to take up the Army bill we could not by a majority vote do so?

The SPEAKER. Why, the Chair thinks that if this order is made it shoves the Army bill out of the way until after the consideration of the District bill.

Mr. GILLET. Then, temporarily, I shall object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the sealer of weights and measures for the District of Columbia has been to see me and has written to me, urging that a bill relating to weights and measures be brought up and passed as soon as possible; that every day, and many times every day in fact, many people are given short weights in ice, and if the purchaser of ice ask that it be weighed the ice man drives away and will not give him any ice; and where complaint is lodged with him on account of short weights of ice those lodging the complaints can not get ice at all. It does seem to me, with hot weather coming on, there ought to be some consideration given to the 75,000 or 100,000 clerks brought here to do the Government's work. They must have ice and should not be given short weight when they buy it.

Mr. GILLET. I will say that if the gentlemen who are responsible for the business of the House think that it is more

important to determine weights and measures for the District of Columbia than to pass the Army bill, I shall not object.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I thought we had an understanding that bills coming from the Committee on Military Affairs, except on special days, should have the right of way. Now, if the request of the gentleman from Kentucky is consented to, why of course it will make a special day for the consideration of his bills and cut out consideration of the military appropriation bill, which ought to be considered without a moment's delay.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Kentucky will withdraw his request now, and that he will make it following the passage of the military appropriation bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I will modify the request—

Mr. KITCHIN. I have made arrangements with the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs to take up that bill to-day.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I will modify my request by asking unanimous consent that I be given District day immediately following the disposition of the military appropriation bill.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, that very likely will be a week in advance, and I do not think we ought to tie up the time that far ahead.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GILLET. I object to that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects.

#### JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask immediate consideration of the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 45.

*Resolved by the House (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, the 27th day of May, 1918, at 1 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.*

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

#### PENSION BILLS.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. RUSSELL. To call up the bill H. R. 12229, the special order for this morning.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, I am perfectly willing that the time until the joint meeting of the two Houses be used in consideration of these pension bills, but I do not think they ought to stand in the way of two big appropriation bills. The Committee on Military Affairs is awaiting with its Army bill my getting out of the way with an urgent deficiency bill, and if the gentleman will give me assurance he will not press these matters after 1 o'clock—

Mr. RUSSELL. I will agree with the gentleman from Kentucky that if we do not finish these bills before the hour mentioned, we will get out of the way and take them up at some other time.

Mr. SHERLEY. Very well.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12229) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to consider this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know whether the agreement the gentleman made with the gentleman from Kentucky a little while ago refers to all pension bills to come up to-day.

Mr. RUSSELL. I could not commit anybody except myself. There are two on the calendar from the Invalid Pension Committee.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is not assuming to commit the Committee on Pensions?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I have no authority to do that and I so stated to the gentleman.



Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. All right.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill H. R. 12229 was read for amendment, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12229) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of William Wilson, late of Company B, Seventy-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Minnie O'Connor, helpless and dependent child of John C. O'Connor, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Thomas McLarnan, late of Sixth Independent Company, Ohio Sharpshooters, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James H. Goodrich, late of Company F, Sixteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anna Eschbach, helpless and dependent child of David A. Eschbach, late of Company F, Fifty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Simon E. Foust, late of Company D, One hundred and fiftieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John C. Briggs, late of Company C, Fifteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Tyler M. Shroyer, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John T. Roseberry, late of Company I, Fifteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James W. Hill, late of Company G, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Crick, late of Company A, Fifteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry C. Holbrook, late of Company G, One hundred and sixty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Katharine Schellschmidt, divorced wife of Ferdinand Schellschmidt, late of the band, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Robert H. Clark, late of Company B, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edmund Coward, late of Company E, Second Regiment New York Veteran Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mason W. Covell, late of Company M, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martin A. Monroe, late of Company C, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles S. Martin, late of Company A, Fifty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles T. Wolfe, late unassigned, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth M. Keefe, helpless and dependent child of Martin Keefe, late of United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Alden F. Wooster, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Arthur C. Gregg, late of Company B, Twentieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas J. Shisler, late of Company F, Fifty-first Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Whitbeck, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles C. Twyford, late of Company K, Twenty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, Fifth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew J. Bass, late of Company D, Thirty-third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward C. Jeffries, late of Company K, and B, Sixty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henderson Smith, late of Company I, Thirtieth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Franklin Haddock, late of Company M, Eighth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Keiderling, late of Company D, Thirty-fifth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John P. Oakes, late of Company K, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Josiah Ketchum, late of Company A, Eightieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard Jefferson, late of Company H, Eighty-third Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John T. Gregory, late of Second Battery Indiana Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William A. Morton, late of Company D, First Regiment Missouri Engineers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank Godfrey, late of the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph W. McKee, late of Company M, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank M. Daniels, late of Company E, One hundred and sixty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Shaw, late of Company I, One hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rostun C. Welch, late of Company D, First Regiment Oregon Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edwin L. Wilber, late of Company C, Thirtieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel O. C. Marine, late of Company C, Eighty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David M. Bedwell, late of Company C, Fifty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Augustus B. Dotson, late of Company A, Second Regiment Ohio Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cyrus Pinkerton, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Morgan S. Bechtel, late of Company G, One hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$15 per month.

The name of Richard H. Kirby, late of Company F, Seventeenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Kirby, late of Company F, Fifty-eighth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob Buzzard, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rose B. Sutherland, helpless and dependent child of Elias Sutherland, late of Company E, Twelfth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Benjamin A. Linvill, late of Company F, One hundred and thirty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Hatch, late of Company E, Tenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Humphrey Bay, late of Company C, Second Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Bevelly Haugh, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Howe, late of Company A, Fifty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Absalom Erickson, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David H. Walker, late of Company D, One hundred and seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel P. Burns, late of Company H, Two hundred and second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Perry Jarrett, late of Company C, Seventy-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Parks, late of Company G, Forty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Bascue, late of Company I, Eleventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew J. Durgin, late of Company I, Twenty-ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sidney J. Crocker, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Infantry, and One hundred and ninetieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph D. Fulmer, late of Company A, One hundred and seventy-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Enoch E. Boyd, late of Company D, One hundred and ninety-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Arthur M. Hayes, late of Company K, Eighteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Lehman, late of Company D, Seventeenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Channing C. Davis, late of Company D, Forty-fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.



The name of Daniel Berkebile, late of Company G, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob Jewell, late of Company F, One hundred and twenty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry S. Rider, late of Company L, Twenty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and Third Regiment Pennsylvania Provisional Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob M. Wilhite, late of Company D, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Adam B. Shepherd, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac J. Byers, late of Company B, Seventy-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew Moore, late of Company H, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lillie Bircut, helpless and dependent child of Charles Bircut, late of Company A, Twenty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Edward McConnell, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas F. Regan, alias George S. Bennett, late of Battery C, First Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Schneider, late of Company H, One hundred and eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William C. Runyan, late of Company B, Second Regiment Ohio Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ezekiah Smith, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Deborah A. Pierce, former widow of Charles L. Gould, late of Company H, Thirty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Abel S. Fennel, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Erastus A. Buck, alias Erastus N. Buck, late of Capt. Graham's company, Fourteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Daniel W. Nye, late of Company K, First Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis E. Robb, late of Company F, Third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lusina Clouse, widow of David C. Clouse, late of Company B, First Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of William G. Files, late of Company D, Fortieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Owens, late of Company A, Twenty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry C. Carr, late of band, Third New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Justice, late of Company E, Eighty-third Regiment, and Company D, Forty-eighth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John G. Clark, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James H. Layne, Jr., late of Company A, Twenty-fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis M. Cales, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Himmah, widow of William Himmah, late of Company C, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Mary A. Blake, widow of John A. Blake, late of Company C, Fifty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Ann F. Wise, former widow of Andrew M. Wise, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Gilbert Joslin, late of Company H, One hundred and fifty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Emma L. Randall, widow of George W. Randall, late of Company B, One hundred and ninety-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Anderson Boyd, late of Company G, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Augustus McClafflin, late of Company A, Sixty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Wilson, 2d, late of Company B, First Regiment Indiana Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas J. Morris, late of Company B, Seventy-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Durham, late of Company C, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Boyer, late of Company A, One hundred and fiftieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James G. Overstreet, late of Company I, Thirtieth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ephraim J. Smith, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Phebe A. Vaughn, former widow of Charles S. Foote, late of Company E, Ninety-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Mary L. Greenwood, widow of Joseph Greenwood, late of Company I, Forty-third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Carrie E. Magason, helpless and dependent child of James C. Magason, late of Company H, Fifth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Newton Sigsby, late unassigned, One hundredth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John L. Bryan, late of Company G, Fifty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William I. Britton, late of Company D, Forty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eli McMinnis, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and Company I, Twenty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alfred P. Pepper, late of Companies F and C, First Regiment Delaware Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Rogers, late of Company F, First Regiment Delaware Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George A. Coverdale, late of Company C, First Regiment Delaware Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Exira C. Gilmore, widow of Joseph C. Gilmore, late of Company G, Ninety-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Winfield S. Stalnaker, late of Company B, One hundred and forty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward M. Hayhurst, late of Company E, One hundred and twenty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Durbin Longfellow, late of Company B, Fifty-first Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Allen Kelly, late of Company I, Eighteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John B. Lynch, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Bennett W. Burton, late of Company B, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry M. Hutchinson, late of Company C, Fortieth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Leonard, late of Company D, Twentieth Regiment, and Company E, Twenty-ninth Regiment, Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David P. Dunkle, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company A, Twenty-first Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Luther H. Angleberger, late of the Sixteenth Battery, Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John L. Wheeler, late of Company I, Seventeenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sylvester Peters, late of Company D, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin A. Sturtevant, late of Company B, Twenty-third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Aaron McEndre, late of Company E, One hundred and eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Pleasant Crissip, late of Company A, Forty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Clara J. Shoemaker, widow of Isaac Shoemaker, late of Company K, Forty-eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Bradford P. Thornberry, late of Company D, Third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George C. Marshall, late of Company H, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John D. Jameson, late of Companies G and C, Eighth Regiment, and Company C, Fourth Regiment, Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jesse Redman, late of Company K, Ninety-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry N. Tippet, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.



The name of William D. Medley, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James B. Wildes, late of Company K, Fiftieth Regiment Massachusetts Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John M. Thomas, late of Company G, Sixty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Martin, late of Company H, Sixty-second Regiment, and Company G, Sixty-seventh Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Stewart N. McGuire, late of Company D, Forty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac N. Dysard, late of Company F, Fifty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Bradley, late of Company K, Third Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John T. Burten, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Christopher C. Oewiler, late of Company H, One hundred and eighty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert J. Keltner, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James B. Falge, late of Company G, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob Custer, late of Company A, One hundred and fifty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin Bayless, late of Company B, One hundred and fifty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Drucilla T. Collier, widow of Frank M. Collier, late of Company F, First Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Charles A. Wilson, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Keziah Zink, widow of Henry C. Zink, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of James Kinser, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Toland, late of Company C, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hugh McGuckian, late of Companies A and I, Third Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis M. Newgen, late of First Regiment Alabama and Tennessee Independent Vidette Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joel Skelton, late of Company D, One hundred and twentieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harvey Jackson, late of Company I, Second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Cook, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Stephen C. Devol, late of Company A, Thirty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John M. Pike, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Allen B. O'Conner, late of Company I, Twenty-seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Montrose Washburn, late of Company C, Sixteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel A. Larkin, late of Company C, Forty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry T. Henson, late of Company I, Thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abraham Crist, late of Company M, Eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Austin P. Hemphill, late of Company G, Eighty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Fink, late of United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Wesley Melton, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis W. Crane, late of the band, Fortieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Emma O. Lewis, former widow of Abram Barden, late of Company A, Fifty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company G, Fifteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Jesse A. Sisk, late of Company M, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William M. Darnel, late of Company A, Forty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Woodbury Smith, late of Company D, Twenty-seventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martha J. Griffin, helpless and dependent child of George Griffin, late of Company K, One hundred and tenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Levi W. Short, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin J. Switzer, late of Company D, Twenty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elbert N. Cowan, late of Company K, Thirty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Harold, late of Company M, Second Regiment New York Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jasper Williamson, late of Company I, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James A. Hartline, late of Company C, One hundred and sixty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Adam P. Maize, late of Troop K, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jesse Hallcom, late of Company H, Forty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isalah M. Phillips, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anna Bell O'Neal, widow of George E. O'Neal, late of Company G, Thirtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Sylvester A. Simpson, late of Company F, Fortieth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Coombs, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Laurence Mericle, late of Company E, Fifteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Myron S. Towne, late of Company H, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Silvers, late of Company A, One hundred and twenty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Stephen Clifford, late of Twenty-fifth Battery, Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Jones, late of Company E, One hundred and ninety-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. Ford, late of Company G, Seventeenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Julia L. Vaught, former widow of James R. Reed, late of the Eleventh Independent Battery, Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Susan B. Churchill, widow of Elroy Churchill, late of Company A, First Regiment New York Volunteer Mounted Rifles, and Company A, Twenty-third Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of William S. Strode, late of Company G, Fiftieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Davis, late of Company F, Fiftieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert M. Lull, late of Company A, Forty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward D. Mills, late of Company K, Fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alfred Lukens, late of Company K, One hundred and thirty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elliott B. Peck, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Forbes, late of Company M, Second Regiment California Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles J. Schoonmaker, late of the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Archie Morgan, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank Stafford, late of Company B, Sixteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Ampacker, late of Company B, Seventeenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William T. O'Bannon, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Matthias Keller, late of Company B, One hundred and sixty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alexander Yates, late of Company A, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.



The name of Sarah Keys, widow of William T. Keys, late of Company I, Seventy-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Archibald M. Vaughn, alias William Burch, late of Company C, Forty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Kildow, late of Company G, Thirty-first and Eighty-eighth Regiments Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. Beatty, late of Company I, Ninety-sixth Regiment, and Company A, Seventy-seventh Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Bertha Hansmann, helpless and dependent child of Joseph Hansmann, late of Company B, Third United States Reserve Corps, Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Alfred Blake, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret L. Cisney, widow of John W. Cisney, late of Company I, Fifty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of William D. Jones, late of Company E, Twenty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joshua Woodworth, late of Company D, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Archibald P. Cooper, sr., late of Company D, Forty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William E. Blanchard, late of Company C, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martha R. Benner, widow of George Benner, late of Company F, Seventy-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Thomas Thacker, late of United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jesse Stewart, late of Company K, Fortieth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Gustave Bentz, late of Company L, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Larkin Kennedy, late of Company E, Fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Allen Morris, late of Company H, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Dallas Poston, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Elble, late of Company H, Thirty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Duffy Duquette, late of Company E, Fifteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. Crabb, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Abbott, former widow of John H. Brautner, late of Company I, Forty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Emanuel Rowley, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. Wilson, late of Company G, Ninety-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lydia E. Johnson, widow of Thomas W. Johnson, late of Company H, One hundred and forty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of George W. Reed, late of Company K, Tenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Paul Webster, late of Company A, Twentieth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Hostutler, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Rodenbeck, late of Company G, One hundred and twentieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mathew Gullett, late of Companies L and B, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Paul A. Lynch, late of Company F, Thirty-third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ellen Froman, widow of Isaac M. Froman, late of Company D, Tenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of James A. Jones, late of Company C, One hundred and ninety-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Parker, late of Company G, Forty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John F. Porter, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and Company G, Sixty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John P. Simer, late of Company F, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Ross, late of Company D, Eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry G. Gardner, late of Company F, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

H. R. 771. William Wilson.	H. R. 10039. James M. Wilson, 2d.
H. R. 827. Minnie O'Connor.	H. R. 10055. Thomas J. Morris.
H. R. 828. Thomas McLarnan.	H. R. 10085. William Durham.
H. R. 1031. James H. Goodrich.	H. R. 10091. Joseph Boyer.
H. R. 1092. Anna Eschbach.	H. R. 10072. James G. Overstreet.
H. R. 1094. Simon E. Foust.	H. R. 10100. Ephraim J. Smith.
H. R. 1377. John C. Briggs.	H. R. 10127. Phebe A. Vaughn.
H. R. 1395. Tyler M. Shroyer.	H. R. 10176. Mary L. Greenwood.
H. R. 1398. John T. Roseberry.	H. R. 10218. Carrie E. Magason.
H. R. 1486. James W. Hill.	H. R. 10252. Newton Sigsby.
H. R. 1492. Thomas Creek.	H. R. 10393. John L. Bryan.
H. R. 1515. Henry C. Holbrook.	H. R. 10456. William I. Britton.
H. R. 2219. Katharine Schell-schmidt.	H. R. 10493. Eli McMinis.
H. R. 2484. Robert H. Clark.	H. R. 10507. Alfred P. Pepper.
H. R. 2524. Edmund Coward.	H. R. 10517. John W. Rogers.
H. R. 2585. Mason W. Covell.	H. R. 10520. George A. Coverdale.
H. R. 2527. Martin A. Monroe.	H. R. 10563. Exira C. Gilmore.
H. R. 2563. Charles S. Martin.	H. R. 10568. Winfield S. Stalnaker.
H. R. 2803. Charles T. Wolfe.	H. R. 10597. Edward M. Hayhurst.
H. R. 3106. Elizabeth M. Keefe.	H. R. 10633. Durbin Longfellow.
H. R. 3109. Alden F. Wooster.	H. R. 10643. Allen Kelly.
H. R. 3236. Arthur C. Gregg.	H. R. 10743. John B. Lynch.
H. R. 3675. Thomas J. Shisler.	H. R. 10762. Bennett W. Burton.
H. R. 3723. John W. Whitbeck.	H. R. 10765. Henry M. Hutchinson.
H. R. 3864. Charles C. Twyford.	H. R. 10781. Thomas Leonard.
H. R. 3914. Andrew J. Bass.	H. R. 10802. David P. Dunkle.
H. R. 4259. Edward C. Jeffries.	H. R. 10816. Luther H. Angleberger.
H. R. 4306. Henderson Smith.	H. R. 10817. John L. Wheeler.
H. R. 4442. Franklin Haddock.	H. R. 10822. Sylvester Peters.
H. R. 4484. Charles Keiderling.	H. R. 10834. Benjamin A. Sturte-vant.
H. R. 4541. John P. Oakes.	H. R. 10839. Aaron McEndre.
H. R. 4785. Josiah Ketchum.	H. R. 10840. Pleasant Crissip.
H. R. 4828. Richard Jefferson.	H. R. 10858. Clara J. Shoemaker.
H. R. 4856. John T. Gregory.	H. R. 10884. Bradford P. Thorn-berry.
H. R. 5003. William A. Morton.	H. R. 10900. George C. Marshall.
H. R. 5138. Frank Godfrey.	H. R. 10903. John D. Jameson.
H. R. 5364. Joseph W. McKee.	H. R. 10921. Jesse Redman.
H. R. 5628. Frank M. Daniels.	H. R. 10961. Henry N. Tippet.
H. R. 5642. George W. Shaw.	H. R. 10997. William D. Medley.
H. R. 5783. Rostun C. Welch.	H. R. 11000. James B. Wildes.
H. R. 5843. Edwin L. Wilber.	H. R. 11040. John M. Thomas.
H. R. 5959. Daniel O. C. Marine.	H. R. 11058. John W. Martin.
H. R. 6438. David M. Bedwell.	H. R. 11091. Stewart N. McGuire.
H. R. 6629. Augustus B. Dotson.	H. R. 11092. Isaac N. Dysard.
H. R. 6832. Cyrus Pinkerton.	H. R. 11097. Edward Bradley.
H. R. 6881. Morgan S. Bechtel.	H. R. 11127. John T. Burten.
H. R. 6853. Richard H. Kirby.	H. R. 11132. Christopher C. Ole-willer.
H. R. 6398. James Kirby.	H. R. 11156. Robert J. Keltner.
H. R. 6789. Jacob Buzzard.	H. R. 11158. James B. Paige.
H. R. 6902. Rose B. Sutherland.	H. R. 11162. Jacob Custer.
H. R. 7065. Benjamin A. Linvill.	H. R. 11163. Benjamin Bayless.
H. R. 7085. John Hatch.	H. R. 11241. Drucilla T. Collier.
H. R. 7214. Humphrey Bay.	H. R. 11256. Charles A. Wilson.
H. R. 7215. Benevell Haugh.	H. R. 11260. Keziah Zink.
H. R. 7287. Henry Howe.	H. R. 11263. James Kinsler.
H. R. 7425. Absalom Erickson.	H. R. 11795. Charles J. Schoon-
H. R. 7435. David H. Walker.	H. R. 11264. George W. Toland.
H. R. 7436. Samuel P. Burns.	H. R. 11272. Hugh McGuckian.
H. R. 7443. Perry Jarrett.	H. R. 11289. Francis M. Newgen.
H. R. 7536. George W. Parks.	H. R. 11294. Joel Skelton.
H. R. 7577. William H. Bascue.	H. R. 11297. Harvey Jackson.
H. R. 7602. Andrew J. Durgin.	H. R. 11337. George Cook.
H. R. 7655. Sidney J. Crocker.	H. R. 11360. Stephen C. Devol.
H. R. 7671. Joseph D. Fuimer.	H. R. 11381. John M. Pike.
H. R. 7784. Enoch E. Boyd.	H. R. 11396. Allen B. O'Conner.
H. R. 7824. Arthur M. Hayes.	H. R. 11397. Montrose Washburn.
H. R. 7841. George W. Lehman.	H. R. 11402. Daniel A. Larkin.
H. R. 7874. Channing C. Davis.	H. R. 11434. Henry T. Henson.
H. R. 7974. Daniel Berkeblie.	H. R. 11436. Abraham Crist.
H. R. 7993. Jacob Jewell.	H. R. 11438. Austin P. Hemphill.
H. R. 8055. Henry S. Rider.	H. R. 11441. John Fink.
H. R. 8096. Jacob M. Wilhite.	H. R. 11462. John Wesley Melton.
H. R. 8102. Adam B. Shepherd.	H. R. 11467. Lewis W. Crane.
H. R. 8153. Isaac J. Byers.	H. R. 11499. Emma O. Lewis.
H. R. 8294. Andrew Moore.	H. R. 11500. Jesse A. Sisk.
H. R. 8380. Lillie Bircut.	H. R. 11502. William M. Darnel.
H. R. 8500. Edward McConnell.	H. R. 11503. Woodbury Smith.
H. R. 8523. Thomas F. Regan, alias George S. Bennett.	H. R. 11504. Martha J. Griffin.
H. R. 8590. William Schneider.	H. R. 11505. Levi W. Short.
H. R. 8591. William C. Runyan.	H. R. 11511. Benjamin J. Switzer.
H. R. 8700. Hezekiah Smith.	H. R. 11563. Elbert N. Cowan.
H. R. 8911. Deborah A. Pierce.	H. R. 11566. James Harrold.
H. R. 8916. Abel S. Fennell.	H. R. 11594. Jasper Williamson.
H. R. 9041. Erastus A. Buck, alias Erastus N. Buck.	H. R. 11606. James A. Hartline.
H. R. 9103. Daniel W. Nye.	H. R. 11608. Adam P. Malze.
H. R. 9105. Francis E. Robb.	H. R. 11624. Jesse Hallcom.
H. R. 9323. Lusina Clouse.	H. R. 11632. Isaiah M. Phillips.
H. R. 9380. William G. Files.	H. R. 11637. Anna Bell O'Neal.
H. R. 9470. Charles Owens.	H. R. 11651. Sylvester A. Simpson.
H. R. 9619. Henry C. Carr.	H. R. 11653. John Coombs.
H. R. 9693. George W. Justice.	H. R. 11669. Laurence Mericle.
H. R. 9793. John G. Clark.	H. R. 11687. Myron S. Towae.
H. R. 9882. James H. Layne, jr.	H. R. 11688. George W. Silvers.
H. R. 9896. Lewis M. Cales.	H. R. 11690. Stephen Clifford.
H. R. 9920. Mary A. Himmah.	H. R. 11700. Daniel Jones.
H. R. 9946. Mary A. Blake.	H. R. 11707. Benjamin F. Ford.
H. R. 9975. Ann F. Wise.	H. R. 11708. Julia L. Vauclt.
H. R. 9978. Gilbert Joslin.	H. R. 11719. Susan B. Churchill.
H. R. 9981. Emma L. Randall.	H. R. 11728. William S. Stode.
H. R. 9995. Anderson Boyd.	H. R. 11732. Samuel Davis.
H. R. 10038. Augustus McClaffin.	H. R. 11735. Albert M. Lull.



H. R. 11779. Edward D. Mills.  
H. R. 11781. Alfred Lukens.  
H. R. 11783. Elliott B. Peck.  
H. R. 11793. Joseph Forbes.  
H. R. 11795. Charles J. Schoon-  
maker.  
H. R. 11797. Archie Morgan.  
H. R. 11808. Frank Stafford.  
H. R. 11811. William Amspacher.  
H. R. 11812. William T. O'Bannon.  
H. R. 11813. Matthias Keller.  
H. R. 11815. Alexander Yates.  
H. R. 11823. Sarah Keyes.  
H. R. 11845. Archibald M. Vaughn,  
alias William Burch.  
H. R. 11846. William Kildow.  
H. R. 11852. John H. Beatty.  
H. R. 11859. Bertha Hansmann.  
H. R. 11864. Alfred Blake.  
H. R. 11879. Margaret L. Cisney.  
H. R. 11885. William D. Jones.  
H. R. 11888. Joshua Woodworth.  
H. R. 11889. Archibald P. Cooper,  
sr.  
H. R. 11891. William E. Blanchard.  
H. R. 11892. Martha R. Benner.  
H. R. 11900. Thomas Thacker.

H. R. 11902. Jesse Stewart.  
H. R. 11904. Gustave Bentz.  
H. R. 11905. Larkin Kennedy.  
H. R. 11917. Allen Morris.  
H. R. 11918. Dallas Poston.  
H. R. 11926. Joseph Elble.  
H. R. 11937. Duffy Duquette.  
H. R. 11944. John H. Crabb.  
H. R. 11972. Mary A. Abbott.  
H. R. 11979. Emanuel Rowley.  
H. R. 11991. John H. Wilson.  
H. R. 11992. George W. Reed.  
H. R. 12006. Lydia E. Johnson.  
H. R. 12023. Paul Webster.  
H. R. 12027. Edward Hostutler.  
H. R. 12065. William H. Roden-  
beck.  
H. R. 12073. Mathew Gullett.  
H. R. 12094. Paul A. Lynch.  
H. R. 12104. Ellen Froman.  
H. R. 12120. James A. Jones.  
H. R. 12129. Daniel Parker.  
H. R. 12164. John F. Porter.  
H. R. 12168. John P. Simer.  
H. R. 12195. William H. Ross.  
H. R. 12208. Henry G. Gardner.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at the end of the bill the following:

"The name of Elizabeth Wise, former widow of John Dodson, late of Company I, Eighty-eighth Regiment Illinois Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 a month."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. ASHBROOK: Insert as a separate paragraph the following:

"The name of Elizabeth S. Reed, widow of Caleb R. Reed, late acting assistant or contract surgeon, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month, in lieu of that she is now receiving."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. RUSSELL, the motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following House concurrent resolution:

#### House concurrent resolution 45.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday the 27th day of May, 1918, at 1 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4557. An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes.

#### LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leaves of absence were granted as follows:

To Mr. EMERSON, indefinitely, on account of sickness in family.  
To Mr. MANSFIELD, two days, on account of important business.  
To Mr. FAIRFIELD for two weeks.

#### PENSIONS.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill S. 3799, an act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, and I ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk will report the bill for amendment.

The bill S. 3799 was read for amendment as follows:

An act (S. 3799) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Melvina Coquillard, widow of James Coquillard, late captain Company E, Seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month, the same to be paid her without deduction or rebate on account of former alleged overpayments or erroneous payments of pension.

The name of Henry Wenzel, late of Company K, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel S. Wilson, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel H. Brooks, late of Company I, First Regiment Maryland Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Bass, late of Company E, Fiftieth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles E. Wilcox, late of Company A, Thirty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and captain Company B, Ninety-second Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Adam Eckert, late of Company H, Third Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert Boon, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert S. Greene, late of Company A, Seventeenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Burns, late of U. S. S. *Potomac* and *Horace Beals*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert Liddell, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Amos Dickinson, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry A. Dayton, late of Company E, Nineteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Theodore C. Bates, late of Company F, Second Battalion, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Marks, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alexander Reed, late of Company A, Seventeenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William L. Swiger, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas J. Denny, late of Company M, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Grigg, late of Company D, Fifty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William L. V. Kite, late of Company D, Fifth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel B. Mills, late of Company E, Ninety-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William O'Callaghan, late of U. S. S. *Fahkee*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Wones, late of Company I, One hundred and fifty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederick S. Webber, late of U. S. S. *Ohio*, *Bat*, and *Hornet*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jerome McWethy, late of Company G, Second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary L. King, widow of Josias R. King, late lieutenant colonel Second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James Campbell, late of Company K, Fortieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Patrick, late of Company D, One hundred and fifty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Wyckoff, late of Company I, Ninety-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hugh S. Ryan, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harvey Johnson, late of Company I, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Myron Gilmore, late of Company B, Ninety-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Marion A. Babcock, late of Company A, Thirty-sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. Brock, late of Company G, One hundred and seventieth Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Loreta Blevins, widow of Dillion Blevins, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$37 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Robert T. C. Blevins, helpless and dependent child of said Dillion Blevins, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Loreta Blevins the name of the said Robert T. C. Blevins shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of the death of the said Loreta Blevins.

The name of Hannah McAdams, widow of Patrick McAdams, late sergeant major, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Ferdinand Fetter, late of Company I, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Hoyt, late of U. S. S. *Silver Lake* and *Red Rover*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John B. Donaldson, late of Third Independent Battery Iowa Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John E. Clark, late of Company C, First Regiment Alabama and Tennessee Independent Vidette Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Patterson, late first lieutenant Company I, Thirty-eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Clifford A. Lewis, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Georgianna Thomas, widow of Jacob Thomas, alias Jacob Doutha, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Thomas J. Gafford, late of Company K, Seventeenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah J. Briles, former widow of Noah W. Briles, late of Company I, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of John A. Wise, late of Company B, Forty-fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rosa Flake, widow of Levi Flake, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of John M. Holmes, late of Company F, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John E. Rogers, late of Company D, Tenth Regiment, and Company G, Thirty-second Regiment, Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William S. Reed, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Augustus A. Clawson, late of Company A, Third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Wesley B. Reed, late of Company A, Thirty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Homer E. Benton, late of Company B, Thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nathan H. Ellis, late of Company D, Twenty-third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Walter E. Ellis, helpless and dependent son of Walter B. Ellis, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George Engleman, late of Company E, Forty-fifth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas V. Malone, late of Company I, Thirty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Flagg, late of Company F, Second Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert H. Wood, late of Company D, Twenty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas McCarty, late of Company L, Seventeenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry J. Edge, alias Jason Edge, late of U. S. S. *Benton*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew West, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment, and Company D, Tenth Regiment, West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George D. Abraham, late of Company I, Sixty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Uriah G. Williams, late of Company A, One hundred and ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John C. Emery, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, and assistant surgeon, Thirteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$21 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Tripp, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and second lieutenant Company H, nineteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alonzo Pendland, late unassigned, Thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$21 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas M. Johnson, late of Company A, Twelfth Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James S. Gray, late of Company B, Two hundred and sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac Wharton, late of Company H, Third Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Increase E. Watson, late of Company K, Twenty-fourth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mark Whitney, late musician, band, Thirteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Stokes, late of Company F, One hundred and thirty-fourth Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Melville N. Freeman, late of Company D, Third Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, Ninth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George C. Bonney, late of Company K, Twelfth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Algen S. Leach, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and Company G, Fifty-third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Findley, late of Company D, Fifteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Curles, late of Company G, Ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Wells, late of Company E, Sixty-first Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Derrick Huck, late of Company A, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Seth Bailey, late of Company K, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abbie L. Lockwood, widow of Horace H. Lockwood, late of Company D, Second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and First Independent Company Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Irvin M. Hill, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. McMillen, late of Company B, McLaughlin's squadron, Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and Company C, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Bradford G. Ostrander, late of Company C, Fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William A. Reeves, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Fred Eneker, late of Company C, Forty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Booth, late second lieutenant Company C, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Campbell, late of Company D, First Battalion, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Daniels, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Behre, late musician, band, general service, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles F. Ronyan, late of Company I, Thirty-ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. Denny, late of Company G, Twenty-first Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. Sage, late of Company D, Twentieth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Watkin H. Jones, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Cummins, late of Company E, Eighty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George G. Laughead, late of U. S. S. *Ouachita*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Scott Thompson, late of U. S. S. *General Lyon* and *Great Western*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel C. Howe, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David I. Hain, late of Company C, Forty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lafayette Fasnaugh, late of Company E, Fifty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$18 per month.

The name of John V. Reed, late of Company H, One hundred and fifty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Shuey, late of Company H, Forty-fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.



The name of Harry M. Sherman, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Thomas, late of Company E, Thirty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William J. Seals, late of Company D, Second Regiment East Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alexander D. Smalley, late of Battery F, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Emery O. Pendleton, late of Company I, Fifteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Esburn Nutt, late of Company B, Thirtieth Regiment, Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Freeman D. Myrick, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment, and Company K, Thirtieth Regiment, Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Moses F. Hurd, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William E. Hayden, late of Company E, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel McClure, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry McClure, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Michael O. Sullivan, late of Company H, Sixteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Patrick Walton, late of Company A, Sixteenth Regiment, and Company D, Thirtieth Regiment, Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis Mathews, late of U. S. S. *Michigan*, *John Adams*, and *Santee*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Amariah K. Wheeler, late of Company E, Coast Guards, Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas J. Hargrave, late of Company G, Twenty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George O. Pearl, late of Company H, Eighteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ina L. Murdock, helpless and dependent child of George W. Murdock, late of Company G, Fifteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Daniel W. Shawhan, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry T. Snyder, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George H. Fogg, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Openchain, late of Company K, Forty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Seward Newton, late of Company C, Fifty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaiah P. Watts, late of Company H, Eighty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Sams, late of Company K, Fifteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas G. Davison, late of Company G, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nancy Hackleman, dependent mother of Isaac Hackleman, late of Company L, Second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John L. Rushton, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles W. Wormell, late of the Seventh Battery, First Battalion Maine Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sylvanus Smith, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Hall, late first lieutenant, Company D, Twelfth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Gilbert, late of Company D, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of McHenry Smith, late of Company H, Eightieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Acton, late of Company C, Seventh Battalion, District of Columbia Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$21 per month.

The name of Adrian J. Hayward, late of Company C, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Emma A. Hoskins, widow of Thomas D. Hoskins, late of Company A, Thirty-second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and

former widow of Marvin Norris, late of Company F, One hundred and fifty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of George W. Thompson, late of Company G, Eighteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Milton N. Campbell, late of Company L, Ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac N. Stotts, late of Company I, One hundred and ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Woodward, late of Company D, Fifty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard B. Daniels, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Day, late of Company D, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jared Wheeler, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George B. Gilbert, late of Company C, Twenty-second Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. Annas, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Delos Neer, late of Company K, One hundred and thirty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Murray, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserves Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel H. Pettengill, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Josiah C. Tandy, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Addison S. Martin, late of Company B, Second Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Churchill, late of Company I, Twelfth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Percival, late of Company K, First Regiment California Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Martin, late of Company K, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Angus C. Burns, late of Company F, First Regiment United States Volunteer Sharpshooters, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cornelius McGoff, late of Company D, Third Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nathaniel Wilt, late of Company B, Third Regiment Potomac Home Brigade, Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Smith, late of the U. S. S. *Vanderbilt*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Theodore M. Burge, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Carrie M. Smart, helpless and dependent daughter of William M. Smart, late of Company K, Fifty-first Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Hiram B. Newlon, late of Company E, Seventeenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John F. Brainard, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac D. Rowden, late of Company K, Twelfth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edwin E. Baker, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Enos S. Whitcomb, late of Company K, Twenty-ninth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Chester R. Smith, late of Company K, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Horatio P. Smith, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Franklin Venable, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Capshaw, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James H. Fontaine, late of Company B, Third Regiment, and Company K, Sixth Regiment, Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Fulkerson, late of Company F, Eighty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Michael H. Skinner, late of Company D, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William J. Smith, late of Company I, Fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and Company E, Eighty-fifth Regiment, and Company H, Thirty-third Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.



The name of John H. Bird, late of Company A, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William White, late of Company G, Second Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph P. Case, late of Company E, One hundred and fifty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Washington Richardson, late of Company K, One hundred and ninth Regiment, and Company F, Eleventh Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edwin S. Metcalf, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Vanscoy, late of Company E, Third Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Luther L. Rewalt, late assistant surgeon, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret Dicks, former widow of Andrew Snyder, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and widow of James Dicks, late of Company F, Forty-first Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Benjamin F. Morse, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Widener, alias James W. Foster, late of Company I, First Regiment Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Isenberg, late of Company I, One hundred and eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas K. Hastings, late first lieutenant Company H, One hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Thurston, late of Company I, Sixtieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Gordon, late of Company H, Nineteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Dewire, late of Company B, First Battalion, Nebraska Veteran Volunteer Cavalry, and Company G, First Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Millrons, late of Company D, Eighteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George L. Danforth, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Chester S. Pease, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John D. Swift, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Theodore Routh, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elisha D. Turner, late of Company D, Twenty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Arnold Bauer, late of Company B, Fifty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sylvester Oatman, late of Company D, One hundred and twenty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Imogen P. Ingersoll, widow of Charles T. Ingersoll, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Wilford Herrick, late unassigned, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Newell, late of U. S. S. *Ossipee*, and *Princeton*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Crawford, late of the U. S. S. *Princeton* and *Cornubia*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lulu M. Joseph, widow of Mark Joseph, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and second lieutenant Company L, First Regiment Indiana Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$37 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Edith G. Joseph, helpless and dependent child of said Mark Joseph, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Lulu M. Joseph the name of said Edith G. Joseph shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month, from and after the date of death of said Lulu M. Joseph.

The name of Charles D. Hanscom, late of Company I, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following Senate bills referred to the Committee on Pensions:

S. 136. Melvina Coquillard.	S. 394. John Burns.
S. 243. Henry Welzel.	S. 496. Robert Liddell.
S. 245. Samuel S. Wilson.	S. 506. Amos Dickinson.
S. 266. Samuel H. Brooks.	S. 508. Henry A. Dayton.
S. 273. George W. Bass.	S. 513. Theodore C. Bates.
S. 325. Charles E. Wilcox.	S. 583. John W. Marks.
S. 333. Adam Eckert.	S. 586. Alexander Reed.
S. 335. Albert Boon.	S. 617. William L. Swiger.
S. 384. Albert S. Greene.	S. 658. Thomas J. Denny.

S. 672. George W. Grigg.	S. 2569. William E. Hayden.
S. 683. William L. V. Kite.	S. 2577. Samuel McClure.
S. 688. Daniel B. Mills.	S. 2578. Henry McClure.
S. 690. William O'Callaghan.	S. 2585. Michael O. Sullivan.
S. 703. John Wones.	S. 2615. Patrick Walton.
S. 767. Frederick S. Webber.	S. 2621. Francis Mathews.
S. 880. Jerome McWethy.	S. 2630. Amariah K. Wheeler.
S. 1012. Mary L. King.	S. 2636. Thomas J. Hargrave.
S. 1179. James Campbell.	S. 2647. George O. Pearl.
S. 1235. Edward Patrick.	S. 2664. Ina L. Murdock.
S. 1237. William H. Wyckoff.	S. 2680. Daniel W. Shawhan.
S. 1280. Hugh S. Ryan.	S. 2689. Henry T. Snyder.
S. 1356. Harvey Johnson.	S. 2707. George H. Fogg.
S. 1375. Myron Gillmore.	S. 2723. John Openchain.
S. 1391. Marion A. Babcock.	S. 2740. Seward Newton.
S. 1404. Benjamin F. Brock.	S. 2743. Isaiah P. Watts.
S. 1439. Loreta Blevins.	S. 2752. Edward Sams.
S. 1467. Hannah McAdams.	S. 2815. Thomas G. Davison.
S. 1470. Ferdinand Fetter.	S. 2828. Nancy Hackleman.
S. 1488. John W. Hoyt.	S. 2832. John L. Rushton.
S. 1491. John B. Donaldson.	S. 2842. Charles W. Wormell.
S. 1500. John E. Clark.	S. 2847. Sylvanus Smith.
S. 1508. William H. Patterson.	S. 2855. George W. Hall.
S. 1518. Clifford A. Lewis.	S. 2904. George W. Gilbert.
S. 1614. Georgianna Thomas.	S. 2909. McHenry Smith.
S. 1615. Thomas J. Gafford.	S. 2915. John Acton.
S. 1664. Sarah J. Briles.	S. 2927. Adrian J. Hayward.
S. 1826. John A. Wise.	S. 2930. Emma A. Hoskins.
S. 1831. Rosa Flake.	S. 2940. George W. Thompson.
S. 1833. John M. Holmes.	S. 2942. Milton N. Campbell.
S. 1834. John E. Rogers.	S. 2944. Isaac N. Stotts.
S. 1837. William S. Reed.	S. 2949. William H. Woodward.
S. 1851. Augustus A. Clawson.	S. 2952. Richard B. Daniels.
S. 1858. Wesley E. Reed.	S. 2953. Thomas Day.
S. 1860. Homer E. Benton.	S. 2961. Jared Wheeler.
S. 1883. Nathan H. Ellis.	S. 2963. George B. Gilbert.
S. 1899. Walter E. Ellis.	S. 2966. John H. Annas.
S. 1950. George Engleman.	S. 2976. Delos Neer.
S. 1992. Thomas V. Malone.	S. 2989. George Murray.
S. 2025. George W. Flagg.	S. 2990. Daniel H. Pettengill.
S. 2042. Albert H. Wood.	S. 2991. Josiah C. Tandy.
S. 2048. Thomas McCarty.	S. 2992. Addison S. Martin.
S. 2050. Henry J. Edge, alias	S. 3005. James Churchill.
Jason Edge.	S. 3012. Thomas Percival.
S. 2062. Andrew West.	S. 3013. Joseph Martin.
S. 2067. George D. Abraham.	S. 3016. Angus C. Burns.
S. 2074. Uriah G. Williams.	S. 3017. Cornelius McGoff.
S. 2077. John C. Emery.	S. 3020. Nathaniel Wilt.
S. 2078. William H. Tripp.	S. 3023. Joseph Smith.
S. 2085. Alfonso Pendland.	S. 3084. Theodore M. Burge.
S. 2087. Thomas M. Johnson.	S. 3092. Carrie M. Smart.
S. 2092. James S. Gray.	S. 3093. Hiram B. Newlon.
S. 2096. Isaac Wharton.	S. 3094. John F. Brainard.
S. 2102. Increase E. Watson.	S. 3095. Isaac D. Rowden.
S. 2127. Mark Whitney.	S. 3099. Edwin E. Baker.
S. 2135. John W. Stokes.	S. 3100. Enos S. Whitcomb.
S. 2143. Melville N. Freeman.	S. 3102. Chester R. Smith.
S. 2148. George C. Bonney.	S. 3118. Horatio P. Smith.
S. 2150. Algea S. Leach.	S. 3134. Franklin Venable.
S. 2153. William W. Findley.	S. 3135. William H. Capshaw.
S. 2187. John Curles.	S. 3136. James H. Fontaine.
S. 2198. George Wells.	S. 3137. Thomas Fulkerson.
S. 2199. Derrick Huck.	S. 3156. Michael H. Skinner.
S. 2227. Seth Bailey.	S. 3166. William J. Smith.
S. 2231. Abbie L. Lockwood.	S. 3167. John H. Bird.
S. 2244. Irvin M. Hill.	S. 3168. William White.
S. 2248. John W. McMillen.	S. 3169. Joseph P. Case.
S. 2249. Bradford G. Ostrander.	S. 3170. Washington Richardson.
S. 2284. William A. Reeves.	S. 3179. Edwin S. Metcalf.
S. 2285. Fred Eneker.	S. 3199. Daniel Vanscoy.
S. 2286. William Booth.	S. 3238. Luther L. Rewalt.
S. 2292. George Campbell.	S. 3250. Margaret Dicks.
S. 2304. William W. Daniels.	S. 3318. Benjamin F. Morse.
S. 2306. William Behre.	S. 3340. James M. Widener, alias
S. 2307. Charles F. Runyan.	James W. Foster.
S. 2337. John H. Denny.	S. 3350. William H. Isenberg.
S. 2365. Benjamin F. Sage.	S. 3351. Thomas K. Hastings.
S. 2369. Watkin H. Jones.	S. 3361. William W. Thurston.
S. 2385. James Cummins.	S. 3398. William W. Gordon.
S. 2392. George G. Laughhead.	S. 3407. John Dewire.
S. 2419. Scott Thompson.	S. 3421. James M. Millrons.
S. 2428. Samuel C. Howe.	S. 3447. George L. Danforth.
S. 2446. David I. Hain.	S. 3463. Chester S. Pease.
S. 2466. Lafayette Fasnough.	S. 3499. John D. Swift.
S. 2498. John V. Reed.	S. 3501. Theodore Routh.
S. 2502. James M. Shuey.	S. 3502. Elisha D. Turner.
S. 2505. Harry M. Sherman.	S. 3503. Arnold Bauer.
S. 2508. Henry Thomas.	S. 3507. Sylvester Oatman.
S. 2519. William J. Seals.	S. 3565. Imogen P. Ingersoll.
S. 2520. Alexander D. Smalley.	S. 3568. Wilford Herrick.
S. 2560. Emory O. Pendleton.	S. 3581. Henry Newell.
S. 2581. Esburn Nutt.	S. 3592. George Crawford.
S. 2563. Freeman D. Myrick.	S. 3593. Lulu M. Joseph.
S. 2565. Moses F. Hurd.	S. 3655. Charles D. Hanscom.

The following committee amendments were severally read and severally agreed to:

Page 3, line 27, strike out the following:  
 "The name of Amos Dickinson, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving."

Page 3, line 21, strike out the following:  
 "The name of Henry A. Dayton, late of Company E, Nineteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving."

Page 17, strike out lines 22 to 25, inclusive, as follows:  
 "The name of James Cummins, late of Company E, Eighty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving."

Page 25, strike out lines 4 to 7, inclusive, as follows:  
 "The name of George W. Thompson, late of Company G, Eighteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving."



Page 33, lines 22 to 25, inclusive, strike out the following:  
 "The name of George L. Danforth, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. RUSSELL, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill H. R. 12211.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12211) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to offer an amendment to this bill, and I would like to have 10 minutes in which to explain it. Will the gentleman agree to let me have 10 minutes?

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I will not object to the gentleman having five minutes, but I will certainly object to amending the bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I asked the gentleman to give me 10 minutes. I want to explain the case.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I have no objection to the gentleman being given 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has no control of the time when the bill is considered in the House. He has not any time to dispose of.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not want to insist on going into the Committee of the Whole. I thought perhaps I could arrange it satisfactorily in the way I have suggested.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, does not the gentleman have an hour at his disposal?

The SPEAKER. He does not. If this bill is to be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole, he has five minutes; and nobody else has any more, either.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] objects. Will the gentleman from Ohio make his motion to go into the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, my objection was, knowing that the House was soon to have a recess, that I did not care to make that motion. I wanted to have the bill considered in the House. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12211) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and to certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and widows of such soldiers and sailors, with Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of the bill H. R. 12211, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The bill will have to be read.

Mr. RAKER. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. The bill has not been read yet by the Clerk. The first reading can not be dispensed with until the title has been read. The title has not yet been read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12211) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, this bill comes at a time when the House is crowded and when there may not be fair consideration given to amendments that may be offered. I understand other amendments will be offered. I want to know if the gentleman from Ohio will agree to give me 10 minutes? He will have enough time before the arrival of the President to give me 10 minutes.

Mr. KEATING rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Colorado rise?

Mr. KEATING. I want to make a suggestion that I think will solve the problem. The chairman of the Committee on Pensions is anxious to dispose of the bill before the arrival of the President. Suppose we read the bill and the gentleman from Pennsylvania can offer his amendment at the end of the reading. If we have time then, I have no doubt the gentleman from Pennsylvania will have opportunity to offer an amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If we did that, the "gentleman from Pennsylvania" would be wiped off the limb.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Even if the President should arrive before the completion of the bill, the bill can come up at another time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman will have a great advantage in forcing this bill now, just as the President is expected to arrive.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent has been asked. The bill has been read by title. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will be recognized to offer an amendment at the close of the reading.

Mr. WALSH. There is no difficulty in getting such unanimous consent as that. When the time comes the gentleman can offer his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled—*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I desire to renew my request that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. That will give the gentleman from Pennsylvania a chance.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This is an important bill, as all pension bills are, and it is one that ought to be discussed where there is reason for discussion. I desire to ask the Chairman whether I am not entitled to discuss this bill in general debate?

Mr. RAKER. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There having been debate upon it, I ask whether or not I am not entitled to an hour to discuss this bill?

Mr. KEY of Ohio. The bill not having been read, the gentleman would not be entitled to his hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEY] had the floor, pending the request to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Pennsylvania having been recognized to open the discussion, is he not entitled to the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman was not recognized for that purpose. He was recognized to reserve an objection to dispensing with the first reading of the bill. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. WALSH. That is not in order. This bill is being read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will continue the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Florence Marquis, widow of Fred S. Marquis, late captain of Company M, Eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is proper at this point in the proceedings to offer an amendment to the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The bill is not being read for amendment, and therefore it is not in order to offer amendments at this time. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Edith L. Morgan, widow of Altie M. Morgan, late of Company G, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the two minor children of the said Altie M. Morgan until they reach the age of 16 years.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. WALSH. We are in the committee now.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently there is a quorum present. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of George C. Rimes, late of Company E, Thirty-fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The Clerk has been reading the bill in a tone of voice that is not distinct in the House. It is not the fault of the Clerk, but it is due to the fact that the House is not in order. I desire to make the point of order that the committee is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to make a parliamentary inquiry or to make a point of order?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A point of order, since the Chair has ruled on the question. I make the point of order that the House is not in order.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12211) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### RECESS.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 5 minutes to 1 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 5 minutes to 1 o'clock. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess.

At the expiration of the recess the House resumed its session and was called to order by the Speaker.

#### JOINT MEETING OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE.

At 12 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m. the Doorkeeper, J. J. Sinnott, announced the Vice President of the United States and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Members of the House rose.

The Senate, preceded by the Vice President, and by their Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, entered the Chamber.

The Vice President took the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House the Speaker announces the following committee to conduct the President into the Chamber: Messrs. KITCHIN, SHERLEY, FLOOD, WEBB, GILLET, CANNON, and MOORE of Pennsylvania.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate the Vice President announces as a like committee Senators MARTIN, SIMMONS, CHAMBERLAIN, SAULSBURY, PENROSE, COLT, and KENYON.

At 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m. the President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House and stood at the Clerk's desk amid prolonged applause.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen of the Sixty-fifth Congress, I present the President of the United States. [Applause.]

#### ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 1141).

Gentlemen of the Congress, it is with unaffected reluctance that I come to ask you to prolong your session long enough to provide more adequate resources for the Treasury for the conduct of the war. I have reason to appreciate as fully as you do how arduous the session has been. Your labours have been

severe and protracted. You have passed a long series of measures which required the debate of many doubtful questions of judgment and many exceedingly difficult questions of principle as well as of practice. The summer is upon us in which labour and counsel are twice arduous and are constantly apt to be impaired by lassitude and fatigue. The elections are at hand and we ought as soon as possible to go and render an intimate account of our trusteeship to the people who delegated us to act for them in the weighty and anxious matters that crowd upon us in these days of critical choice and action. But we dare not go to the elections until we have done our duty to the full. These are days when duty stands stark and naked and even with closed eyes we know it is there. Excuses are unavailing. We have either done our duty or we have not. The fact will be as gross and plain as the duty itself. In such a case lassitude and fatigue seem negligible enough. The facts are tonic and suffice to freshen the labour.

And the facts are these: Additional revenues must manifestly be provided for. It would be a most unsound policy to raise too large a proportion of them by loan, and it is evident that the four billions now provided for by taxation will not of themselves sustain the greatly enlarged budget to which we must immediately look forward. We can not in fairness wait until the end of the fiscal year is at hand to apprise our people of the taxes they must pay on their earnings of the present calendar year, whose accountings and expenditures will then be closed. We can not get increased taxes unless the country knows what they are to be and practices the necessary economy to make them available. Definiteness, early definiteness, as to what its tasks are to be is absolutely necessary for the successful administration of the Treasury; it can not frame fair and workable regulations in haste; and it must frame its regulations in haste if it is not to know its exact task until the very eve of its performance. The present tax laws are marred, moreover, by inequities which ought to be remedied. Indisputable facts, every one; and we can not alter or blink them. To state them is argument enough.

And yet perhaps you will permit me to dwell for a moment upon the situation they disclose. Enormous loans freely spent in the stimulation of industry of almost every sort produce inflations and extravagances which presently make the whole economic structure questionable and insecure and the very basis of credit is cut away. Only fair, equitably distributed taxation, of the widest incidence and drawing chiefly from the sources which would be likely to demoralize credit by their very abundance, can prevent inflation and keep our industrial system free of speculation and waste. We shall naturally turn, therefore, I suppose, to war profits and incomes and luxuries for the additional taxes. [Applause.] But the war profits and incomes upon which the increased taxes will be levied will be the profits and incomes of the calendar year 1918. It would be manifestly unfair to wait until the early months of 1919 to say what they are to be. It might be difficult, I should imagine, to run the mill with water that had already gone over the wheel.

Moreover, taxes of that sort will not be paid until the June of next year, and the Treasury must anticipate them. It must use the money they are to produce before it is due. It must sell short-time certificates of indebtedness. In the autumn a much larger sale of long-time bonds must be effected than has yet been attempted. What are the bankers to think of the certificates if they do not certainly know where the money is to come from which is to take them up? And how are investors to approach the purchase of bonds with any sort of confidence of knowledge of their own affairs if they do not know what taxes they are to pay and what economies and adjustments of their business they must effect? I can not assure the country of a successful administration of the Treasury in 1918 if the question of further taxation is to be left undecided until 1919.

The consideration that dominates every other now, and makes every other seem trivial and negligible, is the winning of the war. [Applause.] We are not only in the midst of the war, we are at the very peak and crisis of it. Hundreds of thousands of our men, carrying our hearts with them and our fortunes, are in the field, and ships are crowding faster and faster to the ports of France and England with regiment after regiment, thousand after thousand, to join them until the enemy shall be beaten and brought to a reckoning with mankind. [Applause.] There can be no pause or intermission. The great enterprise must, on the contrary, be pushed with greater and greater energy. The volume of our might must steadily and rapidly be augmented until there can be no question of resisting it. If that is to be accomplished, gentlemen, money must sustain it to the utmost. Our financial programme must no more be left in doubt or suffered to lag than our ordnance programme or our ship programme or our munitions programme or our programme for making mil-



lions of men ready. These others are not programmes, indeed, but mere plans upon paper, unless there is to be an unquestionable supply of money.

That is the situation, and it is the situation which creates the duty, no choice or preference of ours. There is only one way to meet that duty. We must meet it without selfishness or fear of consequences. Politics is adjourned. The elections will go to those who think least of it; to those who go to the constituencies without explanations or excuses, with a plain record of duty faithfully and disinterestedly performed. I, for one, am always confident that the people of this country will give a just verdict upon the service of the men who act for them when the facts are such that no man can disguise or conceal them. There is no danger of deceit now. An intense and pitiless light beats upon every man and every action in this tragic plot of war that is now upon the stage. If lobbyists hurry to Washington to attempt to turn what you do in the matter of taxation to their protection or advantage, the light will beat also upon them. There is abundant fuel for the light in the records of the Treasury with regard to profits of every sort. The profiteering that can not be got at by the restraints of conscience and love of country can be got at by taxation. [Applause.] There is such profiteering now and the information with regard to it is available and indisputable.

I am advising you to act upon this matter of taxation now, gentlemen, not because I do not know that you can see and interpret the facts and the duty they impose just as well and with as clear a perception of the obligations involved as I can, but because there is a certain solemn satisfaction in sharing with you the responsibilities of such a time. The world never stood in such case before. Men never before had so clear or so moving a vision of duty. I know that you will begrudge the work to be done here by us no more than the men begrudge us theirs who lie in the trenches and sally forth to their death. There is a stimulating comradeship knitting us all together. And this task to which I invite your immediate consideration will be performed under favorable influences if we will look to what the country is thinking and expecting and care nothing at all for what is being said and believed in the lobbies of Washington hotels, where the atmosphere seems to make it possible to believe what is believed nowhere else. [Applause.]

Have you not felt the spirit of the Nation rise and its thought become a single and common thought since these eventful days came in which we have been sending our boys to the other side? I think you must read that thought, as I do, to mean this, that the people of this country are not only united in the resolute purpose to win this war but are ready and willing to bear any burden and undergo any sacrifice that it may be necessary for them to bear in order to win it. [Applause.] We need not be afraid to tax them, if we lay taxes justly. They know that the war must be paid for and that it is they who must pay for it, and if the burden is justly distributed and the sacrifice made a common sacrifice from which none escapes who can bear it at all, they will carry it cheerfully and with a sort of solemn pride.

I have always been proud to be an American, and was never more proud than now, when all that we have said and all that we have foreseen about our people is coming true. The great days have come when the only thing that they ask for or admire is duty greatly and adequately done; when their only wish for America is that she may share the freedom she enjoys; when a great, compelling sympathy wells up in their hearts for men everywhere who suffer and are oppressed; and when they see at last the high uses for which their wealth has been piled up and their mighty power accumulated and, counting neither blood nor treasure now that their final day of opportunity has come, rejoice to spend and to be spent through a long night of suffering and terror in order that they and men everywhere may see the dawn of a day of righteousness and justice and peace. Shall we grow weary when they bid us act? [Applause.]

May I add this word, gentlemen? Just as I was leaving the White House I was told that the expected drive on the western front had apparently begun. You can realize how that solemnized my feeling as I came to you, and how it seemed to strengthen the purpose which I have tried to express in these lines.

I have admired the work of this session. The way in which the two Houses of the Congress have cooperated with the Executive has been generous and admirable, and it is not in any spirit of suggesting duty neglected, but only to remind you of the common cause and the common obligation that I have ventured to come to you to-day. [Applause.]

At 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m. the President retired from the Hall of the House.

At 1 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m. the Speaker announced that the joint session was dissolved.

Thereupon the Vice President and the Members of the Senate returned to their Chamber.

#### PENSIONS.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of the bill H. R. 12211, the pension bill.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman withhold that for a moment? It is my understanding that the gentleman intends to finish the bill by a quarter of 2 o'clock, and, failing in that, will not further press it to-day.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to stand in the way of the chairman of a big committee who has an important bill up, but at the same time we had a distinct agreement that we could proceed with pension bills after the oil bill was out of the way. In view of the fact that the bill will not take more than 10 minutes to finish, we ought to be able to get through before a quarter of 2 o'clock, but I do not want to be tied up.

Mr. SHERLEY. And I do not want to tie the House up, which is more important than tying the gentleman up. If the gentleman will agree to move that the committee rise at a quarter of 2 if the bill is not finished, I shall not insist on a division.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Chair to the unanimous-consent agreement by which the pension bills have the right of way. Saturday's Record shows this colloquy:

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I desire also to submit an inquiry, and that is whether the order which was entered by unanimous consent to consider pension bills would not make those pension bills in order on Monday?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is inclined to think that it would.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It is my impression that there was unanimous-consent agreement in respect to taking up the pension bills.

Mr. RUSSELL. There was a unanimous-consent agreement to take up the pension bills following the disposition of the oil bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk informs the Chair that the order was that the pension bills were to follow the disposition of the oil bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. And if we adjourn now those bills will be in order on Monday.

The SPEAKER. They would.

Mr. SHERLEY. Pension bills are in order, but the House has a right to determine whether it wants to go into Committee of the Whole on the pension bills. If the day is to be taken up with pension bills, I am going to give the House a chance to determine whether it is more important to pass pension bills than it is an important deficiency bill for the prosecution of the war.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think the gentleman will save time to let the pension bills go through.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If I have the right to yield.

Mr. CANNON. This is a private pension bill. Has the gentleman any reason to believe that there will not be ample time within 10 days or 2 weeks to pass all these pension bills, and does not he think it is more important to consider the deficiency bill and the Army bill, in order that they may get to the Senate, with a view of hastening as early an adjournment as possible?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not think the pension bill will take more than 15 or 20 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, there is only one amendment to be offered—the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania—and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole, with the understanding that at the end of the reading of the bill for amendment the gentleman from Pennsylvania be given 10 minutes in which to explain his amendment and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEY] be given 5 minutes in which to reply. That will dispose of the whole matter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole, that it shall be read through for amendment, and at the end of the reading the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] shall have the right to offer an amendment and have 10 minutes in which to advocate and explain it, and at the end of his 10 minutes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEY] shall have 5 minutes, and that that shall be the end of it.

Mr. WALSH. Does that comprehend the disposition of the further reading of the bill?

Mr. KEATING. And that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] suggests that we agree to end the entire proceeding by 2 o'clock. If we can get through by that time, I am willing that that should be put in.

The SPEAKER. And the further condition that the whole thing shall be ended by 2 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object to the last provision; we will probably get through anyway.

Mr. KEATING. Then I withdraw the latter part of the request, that we finish by 2 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment. The Clerk read the bill through for amendment.

An act (H. R. 12211) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Florence Marquis, widow of Fred S. Marquis, late captain of Company M, Eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Edith L. Morgan, widow of Altie M. Morgan, late of Company G, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the two minor children of the said Altie M. Morgan until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of George C. Rimes, late of Company E, Thirty-fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Etta M. Browning, widow of Isaac R. Browning, late of Company C, First Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the three minor children of the said Isaac R. Browning until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Sarah B. Greene, dependent mother of Benjamin J. Greene, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ethan H. Allen, late of Company A, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Engineers, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Edward Blackmer, late of Company G, First Regiment Wyoming Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Annie Neate, widow of John S. Neate, late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Charles H. Payne, late of Company D, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Fred A. Angelo, late of Troop C, Thirteenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lavinia M. Goe, widow of James B. Goe, late major of the Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Samuel E. Spencer, late of the One hundred and twelfth Company United States Coast Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Nichol L. Nelson, late of Company E, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Rufus Boer, late of Company E, Thirty-second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Tucker McG. Simmons, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Virginia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of William M. Largent, late of Troop M, Fifth Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of John P. Hickel, late of Troop A, First Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Dancy, widow of Obe Dancy, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Clara H. Lambert, widow of James F. Lambert, late of Company D, Third Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the three minor children of the said James F. Lambert until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Edith V. Bowman, widow of Thomas E. Bowman, late of One hundred and tenth Company, United States Coast Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child, Charles T., of the said Thomas E. Bowman until he reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Webb W. Belknap, late of Company C, Thirty-second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Douglas D. Powell, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William Reed, late of Battery F, First Regiment United States Artillery, and Troop H, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Margaret E. Patton, widow of Joseph J. Patton, late of Captain Killian's company, Third Regiment North Carolina Volunteers, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Grant H. Hill, late of Company M, Fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Ernst A. Selander, late of Troop C, Fifth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Edward F. O'Toole, late of Company F, Two hundred and first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Ora May Larkin, widow of Charles Larkin, late of Troop A, Eighth Regiment United States Cavalry, war with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Hubert W. Wilson, late captain, Medical Corps, Second Regiment Infantry, Idaho National Guard, Mexican border defense, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James E. Johnson, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Lyman F. Gray, late of the United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Carroll A. Cantrell, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Laura G. Hight, widow of Fielding Hight, late of Capt. Lucas's company, Second Regiment, and Sergt. Capt. Brewster's company, First Regiment, Georgia Volunteers, Indian war, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha Johnson, widow of Merrick Johnson, late of Capt. Morris's independent company, Georgia Mounted Volunteers, Indian war, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Edward Suckow, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Archambault, late of Company C, First Field Artillery Minnesota National Guard, Mexican border defense, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Samuel N. Manro, late of Company G, Fiftieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Jake Blizzard, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George P. Vance, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Lindley Herrington, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Jules J. Toffler, late of Company I, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Clara A. Crosby, widow of Arthur G. Crosby, late of Company F, Thirtieth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month, and \$2 additional per month on account of each of the three minor children of the said Arthur G. Crosby until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of James H. Powell, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Henry Graf, late of Troop A, Seventh Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Ellen Mulligan, widow of John F. Mulligan, late of Company E, Battalion United States Engineers, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child, Agnes, of the said John F. Mulligan, until she reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Ollie Laehn, widow of Charles W. Laehn, late of Company A, Fiftieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and the Sixty-eighth Company United States Coast Artillery, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the three minor children of the said Charles W. Laehn until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Arthur F. Stowell, late of the Twenty-third Battery United States Field Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Jesse D. Nelson, late of Company G, First United States Infantry, and Company E, First Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James A. Swaim, late of Company K, Thirty-third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Geneva M. Lamb, formerly widow of John D. Spittler, late of Company C, First United States Dragoons, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Elizabeth W. Messer, widow of Jacob C. Messer, late of Company H, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Amelia Davis, widow of Leonard Davis, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Alonzo J. Mayo, late of Company G, First Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Alfred Ashton, late of Company H, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ambrose M. Barrett, late of Company L, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Edward P. Aler, late of Company G, Two hundred and second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Jones, widow of Joseph W. Jones, late of Company G, First Regiment North Carolina Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of John M. Flynn, late of Company I, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Leon P. Chesley, late of the One hundred and twenty-first Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ruth R. Herrman, widow of George Herrman, late of Companies L and K, Ninth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child, George R., of the said George Herrman until he reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Lawson Ellsworth, late of Company C, one hundred and sixtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.



The name of Emma L. Green, dependent mother of Frank M. Green, alias Marshall F. Green, late of Company D, First Regiment South Carolina Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles W. Kerlee, late of Troop I, First Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Catherine Mahady, dependent mother of John J. Mahady, late of Battery E, First Field Artillery Minnesota National Guards, Mexican border defense, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James P. Dooley, helpless child of James Dooley, late of Company B, Second Regiment Indiana Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Richard Groebe, late of Troop B, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Katie Clifford, widow of Jerry Clifford, late of Company H, Twenty-first Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the six minor children of the said Jerry Clifford until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Charles H. Hearing, late of Company A, Third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frances L. Young, dependent mother of Henry E. Young, late of Company K, Sixteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Joseph R. Cook, late of Company F, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William James McDermott, late of Company H, First Regiment Colorado Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Fred E. Newell, late of Company G, Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Susan E. Brown, widow of Jesse Brown, late of Company D, Third Regiment United States Dragoons, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Thomas R. Poole, late of Company K, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Salathiel Woodruff, late of Company H, Second Battalion United States Engineers, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Joseph Jiles, late of Company F, Fifteenth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frank H. Campbell, late of band, First Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry A. Jaegle, late of Company M, Tenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James H. Schneider, late of Company C, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Lafayette York, late of Companies H and C, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary A. Lawson, widow of Spencer B. Lawson, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary O. Barbee, widow of Samuel P. Barbee, late of Company B, Second Regiment Kentucky Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Thomas A. Jenkins, late of One hundred and seventieth Company, Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Carrie E. Dennis, dependent mother of Guy C. Dennis, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lafayette Martin, late of Company G, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Louis H. Krafft, late of Company D, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles Depue, late of Company D, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Walter Sewell, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Sarah Ann Cantrell, widow of Merrill Cantrell, late of Walter's Company and captain of a company, Georgia Volunteers, Indian Wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Addie Burns, widow of Thomas Burns, late of Company I, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John L. C. Ellis, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary E. Wainwright, dependent mother of James M. Wainwright, late of Company F, First Regiment Louisiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Herbert R. Dodd, late of Company F, Second Regiment Virginia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Rebecca Strouther, dependent mother of Charles Strouther, late of Company G, Forty-ninth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Belle R. Reid, dependent mother of Wayne R. Jacobs, late of Company A, First Regiment Colorado Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James Duff, late of Company I, First Regiment Florida Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary S. Hollinshead, widow of Rueben P. Hollinshead, late of Company H, First Regiment South Carolina Volunteer Infantry, and Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Alice A. Thorburn, dependent mother of Orin B. Thorburn, late of Company B, Thirty-fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles Schiller, late of Troop B, First Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Gustav T. W. Schmidt, late of Battery F, Fifth United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lois E. Magee, widow of Leon D. Magee, late of Company F, Forty-sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child, Leon D. Magee, jr., of the said Leon D. Magee, until he reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Hugh McGuckain, late of Company I, Fifth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Pensions:

H. R. 512. Florence Marquis.	H. R. 8843. Alonzo J. Mayo.
H. R. 681. Edith L. Morgan.	H. R. 9201. Alfred Ashton.
H. R. 850. George C. Rimes.	H. R. 9304. Ambrose M. Barrett.
H. R. 990. Etta M. Browning.	H. R. 9486. Edward P. Aler.
H. R. 1047. Sarah B. Greene.	H. R. 9601. Elizabeth Jones.
H. R. 1067. Ethan H. Allen.	H. R. 9710. John M. Flynn.
H. R. 1224. Edward Blackmer.	H. R. 9762. Leon P. Chesley.
H. R. 1237. Annie Neate.	H. R. 9770. Ruth R. Herrman.
H. R. 1258. Charles H. Payne.	H. R. 9828. Lawson Ellsworth.
H. R. 1857. Fred A. Angelo.	H. R. 10003. Emma L. Green.
H. R. 1915. Lavina M. Goe.	H. R. 10074. Charles W. Kerlee.
H. R. 2191. Samuel E. Spencer.	H. R. 10137. Catherine Mahady.
H. R. 2250. Nichol L. Nelson.	H. R. 10168. James P. Dooley.
H. R. 2498. Rufus Boer.	H. R. 10221. Richard Groebe.
H. R. 2648. Tucker McG. Simmons.	H. R. 10311. Katie Clifford.
H. R. 2751. William M. Largent.	H. R. 10391. Charles H. Hearing.
H. R. 2760. John P. Hinkel.	H. R. 10428. Frances L. Young.
H. R. 3750. Mary A. Dancy.	H. R. 10599. Joseph R. Cook.
H. R. 3877. Clara H. Lambert.	H. R. 10601. William James McDermott.
H. R. 3958. Edith V. Bowman.	H. R. 10607. Fred F. Newell.
H. R. 4456. Webb W. Belknap.	H. R. 10634. Susan E. Brown.
H. R. 4810. Douglas D. Powell.	H. R. 10667. Thomas R. Poole.
H. R. 4811. Wm. Reed.	H. R. 10726. Salathiel Woodruff.
H. R. 5155. Margaret E. Patton.	H. R. 10735. Joseph Jiles.
H. R. 5162. Grant H. Hill.	H. R. 10767. Frank H. Campbell.
H. R. 5582. Ernest A. Selander.	H. R. 10778. Henry A. Jaegle.
H. R. 5657. Edward F. O'Toole.	H. R. 10815. James H. Schneider.
H. R. 5702. Ora May Larkin.	H. R. 10835. Lafayette York.
H. R. 6040. Hubert W. Wilson.	H. R. 10838. Mary A. Lawson.
H. R. 6416. Jas. E. Johnson.	H. R. 10907. Mary O. Barbee.
H. R. 6826. Lyman F. Gray.	H. R. 10910. Thomas A. Jenkins.
H. R. 6927. Carroll A. Cantrell.	H. R. 10943. Carrie E. Dennis.
H. R. 6929. Laura G. Hight.	H. R. 11081. Lafayette Martin.
H. R. 6930. Martha Johnson.	H. R. 11149. Louis H. Krafft.
H. R. 6952. Edward Suckow.	H. R. 11184. Charles Depue.
H. R. 7097. George Archambault.	H. R. 11229. Walter Sewell.
H. R. 7299. Samuel N. Mauro.	H. R. 11288. Sarah Ann Cantrell.
H. R. 7300. Jake Blizzard.	H. R. 11386. Addie Burns.
H. R. 7452. George P. Vance.	H. R. 11389. John L. C. Ellis.
H. R. 7500. Lindley Herrington.	H. R. 11428. Mary E. Wainwright.
H. R. 7606. Jules J. Toffier.	H. R. 11510. Herbert R. Dodd.
H. R. 7817. Clara A. Crosby.	H. R. 11545. Rebecca Strouther.
H. R. 7832. James H. Powell.	H. R. 11587. Belle R. Reid.
H. R. 7834. Henry Graf.	H. R. 11613. James Duff.
H. R. 7963. Ellen Mulligan.	H. R. 11647. Mary S. Hollinshead.
H. R. 8216. Ollie Laehn.	H. R. 11681. Alice A. Thorburn.
H. R. 8319. Arthur F. Stowell.	H. R. 11810. Gustav T. W. Schmidt.
H. R. 8441. Jesse D. Nelson.	H. R. 11724. Charles Schiller.
H. R. 8469. James A. Swaim.	H. R. 11971. Lois E. Magee.
H. R. 8589. Geneva M. Lamb.	H. R. 11976. Hugh McGuckain.
H. R. 8610. Elizabeth W. Messer.	
H. R. 8800. Amelia Davis.	

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following committee amendment, with the report accompanying it, which I ask to be printed in the RECORD. This amendment is a bill inadvertently left out of the omnibus bill. It has been considered by a subcommittee and by the whole committee, and I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

At the end of the bill insert a new paragraph as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Wesley H. Crockett, late of United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The report is as follows:

H. R. 4059. Wesley H. Crockett, Reed City, Mich., served in the Regular Establishment, United States Navy, on board S. S. Minneapolis from July 30, 1903, until October 26, 1903, when honorably discharged on account of disability. (I. O. 50808.)

The records of the Navy Department show that during service this man was admitted to the hospital for treatment October 10, 1903, for a disease diagnosed as neurasthenia and for disease of nervous system.

He was treated for this and it was pronounced chronic and he was discharged on account of said disease, which was officially held to have existed prior to his enlistment, three months before, and therefore not due to service.

He filed claim for pension in 1904, in which he alleged neurasthenia and claimed that same was due to service in the United States Navy, which was rejected on the ground the records of the Navy Department show that said disease existed prior to enlistment.

On appeal this adverse action was sustained. He filed no evidence other than the testimony of two lay witnesses to the effect that prior to his enlistment he was free from any disease or disability, but that since discharge he has suffered constantly from nervous disorder of a chronic character and is unable to perform manual labor. He also files testimony of a physician showing that since his discharge he has suffered from this disease.

The only board of surgeons which ever examined him reported in 1904 that he suffers from disease of heart and deranged stomach and trouble with the nervous system, evidently neurasthenia, and that there is no evidence of venereal disease or results.

With the bill the petitioner files an affidavit in which he states he is unable to perform labor on account of disease of the nervous system, stomach, and heart, and that the only property he owns is a small lot worth \$100 in Reed City. The Member who introduces the bill assures the committee that his statement as to property is correct. A physician testifies that he suffers from chronic disordered nervous system, with disease of stomach, liver, and spleen.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 11, after the word "receiving," insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"The name of Thomas John Parker, late of the United States Marine Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have asked special consideration for this case for reasons which I shall endeavor to make clear. The Committee on Pensions has a series of rules. They are not rules of the House but are rules of the committee. One of them, rule 3, is as follows:

Rule 3: In no instance will a bill be considered by this committee in connection with which the records of the War or Navy Departments show medical treatment for syphilis, or other venereal disease of an aggravated character, unless the Bureau of Pensions has specifically waived same as a factor in present disabilities, or cause of death.

I have no objection to the enforcement of that rule by the committee, if it did not in some instances work a hardship upon soldiers and sailors; but, due to some agitation in the House heretofore, the committee has felt bound, as I am informed, to adhere strictly to this rule, and to make no exceptions so far as applications for pensions are concerned. Of course, I am in favor of the passage of the bill as reported by the committee. I have asked consideration for the amendment only because I believe there is merit in it and because in this particular instance I think the rule of the committee should be waived. I think it ought to be waived in the interest of fairness, in the interest of actual justice to the applicant, Thomas J. Parker.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I just want to suggest that this committee has the power to waive the rule in a particular case, and in particular cases we do waive it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is all the more reason why the House in which we are now considering this bill should act sympathetically in a case of this kind. Before introducing this bill—and I have very few pension bills and give the committee little trouble—I took pains to find out what was the real reason for the application, and ascertained that the applicant, Parker, who lives in my district and is now 71 years old, a United States marine in the earlier part of his life, was being supported by his wife, who maintains a small tobacco store, from which, I understand, she is now to be ousted. For 40 years this woman has lived with Thomas J. Parker and has maintained him out of the proceeds of her little tobacco store, which, I understand, has not amounted to more than \$10 a week. I was satisfied there was great need in this case before introducing the bill; so careful, in fact, that I had my secretary personally investigate the case and report the conditions. He found the old couple living together in a small home, the husband crippled and blind and the wife doing the best she could to maintain him. She provided for him and attended him, and while both of them are aged and had been living together for 40 years there was nothing in their home life or physical condition apparently to warrant the suggestion that the husband had been afflicted as indicated. Moreover, they had two healthy children living, one with a family and another contributing somewhat to their support.

Mr. KNUTSON. What do the records of the War Department show as to the cause of this blindness?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I looked into that when I found that the committee felt it had to stand by its rule in this case, and learned that although this same condition was charged against the man when his original application was made, he was granted a pension of \$12 per month. Bear in

mind he is now 71 years old. He was granted a pension of \$12 because it was a disputed question among the physicians as to whether the blindness which he suffered was due to rheumatism that he contracted while attending the Boston fire or due to this other disease concerning which the committee held out against him and which he was said to have incurred in 1868. I found on looking it up that the whole matter had been thoroughly thrashed over in the Sixty-first Congress, second session, by the committee in charge at that time and that the following record had been made. Upon this record the pension of \$12 a month was granted him:

The sailor was one of a detachment from the marine barracks who performed arduous and hazardous duty during the Boston fire of 1872, being on duty in the streets for 10 days without relief. There is both medical and lay testimony as to continuance of rheumatism fairly covering the whole period between discharge and the date of application for pension. Of these physicians, some five in number, who testified for the claimant, two were emphatic in their statements that no syphilitic symptoms were to be found, and the others failed to mention same. It is in evidence that sailor entered the Wills Eye Hospital, Philadelphia, October 10, 1881, and that the cause for which he was treated there by Dr. W. W. McClure during the ensuing six months and at intervals thereafter was rheumatic iritis. The sole question in the case is whether the blindness had its origin in the venereal disease of 1868.

Think of it! Whatever the offense was occurred in 1868. Subsequently the man married and subsequently became blind. During all these 40 years this good woman, who is healthy, but aging, has cared for and supported her blind sailor husband. If there was anything wrong with him, why did the Sixty-first Congress grant him a pension of \$12? The testimony does not seem to bear out the suggestion that blindness was due to what occurred before his marriage away back in 1868. The later testimony bears out the statement that his eye trouble was due to the rheumatic affliction resulting from his service at the Boston fire in 1872. Let the committee stand by its rule in ordinary cases, I have no objection; but let the committee see the justice of making an exception in this. I have asked in this instance that the pension be raised from \$12 to \$50. If that is too much I am willing to accept \$30, but I believe the issue might just as well be upon \$50 as \$30. The facts are that the man is blind and helpless; that he has to rely upon an aged woman to maintain him. For her sake, who has borne this charge for 40 years, the committee should be just. If this old misfortune had not arisen, if this red herring, as it were, had not been drawn across the path of this pensioner, I suppose the committee would cheerfully on the known facts, the man being blind and helpless and needing a nurse, have given a pension of \$50 a month. I understand the committee has granted as high as \$75 a month, but in this instance they might grant \$50 since the facts seem so clearly to warrant it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Chair will permit that to be done, although it is contrary to the rule. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple case. The Committee on Pensions has applied exactly the same rule in this case that it has in scores of other cases. If you reverse the committee in this case, in all fairness you should go back and in some way reverse the committee in a score of cases where during the last several years we have applied this rule. Now, the rule is that where the Pension Bureau makes a definite finding that a man's disabilities are directly traceable to syphilis not incurred in the service he shall not be granted a pension. That is all there is to the rule.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, of course, challenges the finding of the Pension Bureau; but I submit that the physicians employed in the bureau have no object in doing an injustice to a claimant for a pension. They make such an investigation as is quite impossible for your committee or the Members of this House or the gentleman from Pennsylvania to make, and those physicians found that the man's blindness was due to syphilis, which of course was not contracted in the service.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In 1868.

Mr. KEATING. In 1868; I do not care what the date may be. That is the finding, and now the gentleman comes in here and tells you a pathetic story about the man, about the excellent reputation he bears, that his wife bears, and that his children bear; but I submit all that has nothing to do with the case. This is a question of whether this House in all seriousness is going on record now as reversing a committee which adheres to a rule that a man who incurs disabilities through loose living and not because of something that he did for his country shall be placed on the honor roll of his country.



Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And he is already there.

Mr. KEATING. He is, by a special act adopted during the Sixty-first Congress, put through here probably before this rule was adopted by the Pension Committee.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. It was.

Mr. KEATING. The Pension Committee adopted the rule because of discussion had on the floor of this House in which the committee was criticized for passing just such bills as the gentleman is endeavoring to insert in this omnibus measure, and the committee felt it ought to adopt such a rule to protect itself, to protect this House, and to protect the pension roll of his Nation. I hope the Members of this House are not prepared to place on this bill such a claim as the gentleman presents even in response to so affecting an appeal as he makes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania) there were—yeas 16, yeas 27.

So the amendment was rejected.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. KEY of Ohio, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 12280, a bill making appropriations for urgent deficiencies, and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent pending the motion, that general debate be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have application for 10 minutes and I would like about 5 minutes myself.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and 15 minutes by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 30 minutes, one-half of that time to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on going into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 12280, the urgent deficiency bill, with Mr. Housron in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 12280, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12280) making appropriations to supply additional urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHERLEY. I suggest the gentleman from Illinois use some of his time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to take up much time upon this bill in general debate. What little I shall have to say will be touching the bill. The gentleman from Kentucky, who, no doubt, is more familiar with the bill than I am, will explain it in his 15 minutes, or as the bill is reached under the five-minute rule.

I just want to call attention to the bill. It carries in round numbers \$123,000,000; it recommends appropriations and authorizations, and as I recollect it, in round numbers about \$5,000,000 less than estimated for. It was prepared after very considerable hearings and after much of consideration. I will not attempt to analyze it in my time.

The appropriations through this fiscal year, since the commencement of the war, amount to \$18,892,027.56, and contracts have been authorized in addition to the amount of \$2,511,562,925.50, adding the amount the deficiency carried in this bill, \$123,674,906.25, and the amount appropriated by act of March 28, \$1,151,000,000, making a total for the current fiscal year of \$22,678,507,127.79.

The House has done its duty according to its best judgment and ability. I think both the House and Senate have freely and liberally cooperated in giving legislation that will enable the war to be conducted efficiently for the first year, and I pray at an early date it will be a successful close for our country as well as for our allies and the world.

Now, I want to say that you do not know and I do not know how the most of this money is to be spent. Oh, it is to be spent for the support of the Army, support of the Navy, the building of ships, advances to the allies. The money is to be expended by the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the President of the United States.

Now, no great amount like the sum we have appropriated this year can be expended without waste. There must be some waste. God alone could make the expenditure of this vast sum without something of waste. We are entitled, however, to believe and demand that we will have the minimum of waste. All that human patriotism can do, all of knowledge that can be commanded, all of integrity that can be brought to the front, shall be brought to the front, and there will be as little waste as possible. But whether it be little or more, we must wait and see.

I am not here to prophesy that there will be undue waste. If we are to have reckless waste or wicked graft at all, it will be bad enough at the close of the war for us to realize it. But in the meantime, as the expenditures are being made, we should inquire to the best of our ability, without blocking the wheels for carrying on the war, what can be done to prevent waste and prevent graft.

Of course, we are all for the winning of the war. There can not be a speech made by anybody, hardly, but that it closes with "the flag," "the Republic," "humanity," "the winning of the war," "righteousness." Well, we are fighting for all those things. Sometimes it is on the tip of my tongue to fall in and make language avowing my patriotic support of the Government in this great emergency. Words are cheap unless action is wise—

Not everyone that sayeth "Lord, Lord," shall enter into the kingdom, but he that doeth the will of the Father.

And we have got to do it—not the will of the Father from day to day, because He does not send us special messages—but we have got to act to the best of our ability according to the aspirations and the hope of the people in order to win the war. And whoever fails in doing his duty, whether he is legislator or whether he is in the Army or the Navy, no matter where he is, must answer for patriotic and intelligent effort. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE].

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in appropriations by Congress. And I was very much interested in what the President stated to us only a few moments ago. I do not recall the exact language the President used, but in substance, as I remember, it was that we could go home or in some way render an account of our stewardship to the people.

Now, I do not know what account of stewardship I can render. When I go home, my people ask me, "What are you doing with the billions and billions of dollars that Congress is appropriating?" I have to answer that I do not know. They can not understand that.

Now, the former distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Fitzgerald, last December estimated, as I recall, that the Government would need \$12,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919. From what information I now can get, the Committee on Military Affairs of the House will ask for that amount alone. It seems to me that at the rate we are going, by June 30, 1919, if war continues that long, we shall probably be called upon to authorize expenditures aggregating \$40,000,000,000.

Now, there is no question about the temperament of the American people. They are willing to contribute the last cent they have to carry on this war and win it. But they want to know where their money is going—what you are doing with it.

I remember on a former occasion here, when the present distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations criticized the late Maj. Gardner of Massachusetts because, as I recall, that distinguished hero had stated in some public utterance "that Congress was spending money like a lot of drunken sailors." I do not wish to speak in a spirit of criticism or in a spirit of partisanship. I have voted for every war measure demanded by the Executive for the successful prosecution of the war since I have been a Member of the House. There has not been any spirit of partisanship in my actions or in my statements. But I must say, to speak the way I feel about it, that the expression "that we spend money like a lot of drunken sailors" is a mild one. We vote and spend money like a lot of rubber stamps, and we never ask one question as to what is being done with it. I remember that here about a year ago we

appropriated with a whoop one morning, with hardly any discussion—I think without any debate—some \$640,000,000 for aircraft work.

Where has that money gone? I do not know, and you do not know. Now and then we get a sniff from Hog Island, Muscle Shoals, or the Arlington Hotel property. I do not know what the character of that sniff is, but I do not believe I am performing my constitutional duty under my oath of office without making an attempt to find out. Do you think that you perform your duty, your responsibility as Members of the House, in voting away billions and billions of money without making any effort to see whether those moneys are expended lawfully and wisely and economically? If you feel that way about it, I do not. But you do not concern yourselves about it.

Under the Constitution all revenue legislation must originate in the House, yet you never say a word or lift your voice as to the proper expenditure of the public funds. The Senate has done much more than we have, and yet it seems to me there is not as much obligation upon the Senate as rests upon Members of the House. It will lead to a public scandal if you do not move.

I introduced a resolution here on April 6, No. 305, to provide for a committee on public accounts, in order that we might have some body that could properly investigate and make a report to the House as to the expenditure of public funds. I do not suppose anything will be done about it. It looks to me as if Members of Congress are impervious to everything except office and death. As to office they are very sensitive, and death they can not escape.

It does not seem to me that the financial resources of this country are inexhaustible. You have not got a bottomless well. We owe it to ourselves and to our country to husband our financial resources, in my judgment, if we are going to win this war, with the same care that we conserve the food products of this country. I call upon you again to take some means—I do not care whether you take my means or not—in order that the House and the country may know what is being done with the people's money. They are willing to give all they have if they know that it will be properly expended.

Why, there is not a subdivision of any State, like a municipality, that does not have an expert accountant go over the expenditures of that municipality and render a report to the legislative body thereof. Yet we sit here in the House like a lot of mummies and are willing to vote perhaps \$40,000,000,000 away without any care or concern as to how those moneys will be expended. We are willing, I guess, to vote away all the power we have and say nothing about it.

Sometimes I wonder what has become of the Sage of Monticello. Has he turned over in his grave, with his face toward the melting pot of the earth, while his professed followers wantonly abandon the great principles he advocated, for which he fought, and to the maintenance of which he dedicated his life? It seems to me that we owe it to ourselves and to the country to do business in a businesslike way. You go upon your knees and beg the people to give to the Red Cross, to the war chest, to buy liberty bonds and thrift stamps, and all that sort of thing, and yet you refuse on the part of the Government to set any example of any degree of thrift yourselves. I tell you it is high time that the Government showed some disposition to exercise a little thrift and economy in public expenditures, and I warn you again and call upon you for action—affirmative action—before it is too late. [Applause.]

We are informed that additional revenue will be raised by increasing taxes upon incomes and excess profits and upon luxuries. It seems to me that we need to exercise some caution to avoid killing the goose that lays the golden egg. As to luxuries, of course we can tax them until the people no longer indulge in them.

As New York State pays between 30 and 40 per cent of all Federal taxes, the people of that State are vitally interested in the question of taxation. We would like to know why a portion of the increased revenues can not be raised from a protective tariff. It has been estimated that \$300,000,000 a year can reasonably be raised by such means, thus relieving our own taxpayers to that extent; and then there is cotton. What about that? But perhaps that is too sacred a commodity for the extraordinarily nonpartisan majority to tax. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I shall not undertake to delay the committee by any reply to the gentleman who has just taken his seat. I am always glad to commend and never in any way hinder, by criticism or otherwise, newly aroused desire for economy on the part of any Member of the House. But I suggest in passing, in a not unkindly spirit, that a good deal of the ignorance to which the gentleman confesses and about which I am not prepared to dispute, could be dissipated by his reading some of the hearings in connection with some of the bills that are brought out. Of course, many of those of us who work more than eight hours a day for many days each month and take testimony running into the thousands of pages are not to be blamed if gentlemen decline to make the effort to read and digest such testimony and if by virtue of that failure, not being in possession of all of the information they would like to have, they prefer to take the course of criticism rather than of affirmative action.

Mr. Chairman, the present bill before the House carries a total of direct appropriations and authorizations of \$123,674,906.25, and while the aggregate is large, the reasons for the amounts recommended can be stated, I think, fully and briefly. Sixty million dollars of it is in compliance with the direct order of the Congress recently given in passing the housing bill, which authorized an expenditure of \$60,000,000 for housing purposes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to have the gentleman tell us of the special advantage he thinks there is in the organization of a corporation to take charge of this work?

Mr. SHERLEY. I had hoped to reach that under the five-minute rule, rather than in the midst of a brief statement.

Mr. MADDEN. The reason I asked that now is because the gentleman has just mentioned the housing matter.

Mr. SHERLEY. The reason is this, and I think it will appeal to the gentleman: It is perfectly manifest that this housing problem does not consist merely in the building of houses by the Government. For my part I hope it will consist least in that. But it consists in part in house building and in operating those houses after they are built. Now, of necessity there is a rigidity and, for want of a better term, a red tape in connection with Government operation which makes it very difficult to carry on efficiently such a continuing business. So much so that the gentleman will recall that in connection with the building of the Panama Canal practically all of the business connected with certain lines of work, such as the maintenance and running of the hotels, the ice plant, and other things, were effected through the medium of the Panama Railroad corporation. Gentlemen will also recall that in connection with the Shipping Board and its activities it was thought that for the purpose of operating the ships and conducting the business that was incident to them it was desirable to have a corporation, Government owned, and accordingly the Emergency Fleet Corporation was created.

This is not made mandatory. It is simply given to the President as an option, because of the belief on the part of the committee that there might be the need of such a medium for successfully carrying out the objects of the original legislation.

Mr. MADDEN. In other words, the committee believes that it will be more likely to be conducted as a strictly business proposition under this plan?

Mr. SHERLEY. Very much so, more economically, and with less approach to socialism by virtue of it.

Now, continuing the statement touching the items in the bill, the other large item in the way of cash is \$25,907,000 for the Navy. This represents a number of items, all of which are set out in some detail in the report. Pay, miscellaneous, \$1,250,000. The gentleman who spoke a few minutes ago [Mr. MAGEE] wanted to know where a good deal of money is going. Some of it is going in the same way that this item of a million and a quarter goes, to the increased size of the Navy. Transportation of enlisted personnel, \$1,000,000. The same statement applies to that. Ordnance and ordnance stores, \$4,500,000.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is the gentleman advised as to whether any effort will be made to build a nitrate plant out of this?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; but I should say to the gentleman that if it were necessary to get powder and to get nitrates, and they did not take steps to do it, he and I would be the first men on this floor to criticize the failure properly to furnish the most essential thing in connection with the prosecution of the war.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Oh, assuredly, I entirely agree with the gentleman; but the gentleman will recall that out of a similar



bill reported and passed under the gentleman's direction not very long ago, more than \$50,000,000 was taken without a word of hearing—

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; and the answer to that lies, not in the fact that it was taken but whether it was taken and spent wisely; and about that fact the Committee on Appropriations hope to be able to give to the House further information.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I would be very glad if the committee would.

Mr. SHERLEY. I know the gentleman will be glad, and I am quite sure that I will be glad to give the gentleman the information.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for another question? I do not want to embarrass the gentleman.

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly. The gentleman never embarrasses me. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MADDEN. It occurs to me, and perhaps there is no way to remedy it, but I thought it might be wise to call the gentleman's attention to it, so that in investigating deficiencies he might care to look into it, or he might not think it worth while to look into it. For example, transferring men in the Army 8, 10, or 15 times from one place to another before they are finally located—whether some system ought not to be put into effect that would prevent the wasteful extravagance brought about in these transfers.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman that there can be, and ought to be, a reformation in the matter of travel expense for both the services, and I have taken occasion, not once but a number of times, to express to men having the matter in charge the hope that they would very carefully guard against such abuses. But in response to the gentleman's inquiry I want to say that it is perfectly manifest that no man, no matter what his capacity, can hope to undertake to go into a review of expenditures that total billions of dollars without such delay as to preclude his appropriating other moneys that are needed at the time when needed. If the committee may be allowed to say it fairly and modestly, I believe that it has made as full inquiry, not only touching this bill but every other bill that it has reported, as is possible in the time at its disposal. And may I repeat again that if gentlemen would sometimes read our hearings they would have a better appreciation of what the committee has endeavored to do in arriving at the facts.

Mr. MADDEN. I am sure the committee is doing everything that it can do. The question I asked has no bearing on this bill at all—

Mr. SHERLEY. I understand that.

Mr. MADDEN. But I have noticed that sometimes whole units will be ordered, say, to Fort Dodge, and then to Fort Sam Houston, and then to Fort Hancock, and then to some other port before they are finally located. It seems to me that there ought to be some way to reach that.

Mr. SHERLEY. The real way to reach it, and the only way to reach it, is through the efficiency of the military organization itself. I had occasion a week or so ago to call attention to a report recently made by a select committee of the House of Commons of the British Parliament in connection with the munitions portfolio. There was in that report a statement that was strikingly familiar in sound. That was, in substance, that the only thing that stood between the English taxpayer and the extravagant expenditure of money was the wisdom and the efficiency of the administrative officers who were charged with the expenditure, and that statement is just as true of America as it is of England, and it is true of both, not by virtue of the existence or the absence of any legislative machinery but by virtue of the facts that are inherent in the case. When a war is going on time is so important that investigation to prevent extravagance, if undertaken at the time of the appropriation, results in such delay as to be unjustifiable, and all you can do is when you find specific abuses to correct them as well as you can, and to impress, as I have endeavored to impress upon every administrative officer who has come before the committee, the solemn responsibility that rests upon him at this time to protect the Government against useless expenditure of money.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. I want to ask the gentleman a question of detail merely. About two years ago certain fire insurance companies in the country got into a controversy with the Treasury Department as to the tax that they should pay under the revenue act. Of course, they paid the amount assessed by the Treasury Department and then brought proceedings for a rebate. These proceedings were decided in their favor, and in many cases agreements were entered into in their favor about a year ago. I have inquired of the Treasury Department a number of times about the payment of the claim, and they said

that they had no money available for the purpose and have been inclined to suggest that Congress was derelict in not making the appropriation.

Mr. SHERLEY. Their suggestion was gratuitous and unwarranted. When they certify the claims to Congress, if they are proper and just claims, regularly audited, they will be carried in the general deficiency bill.

Mr. ROGERS. The Treasury Department has never certified them to Congress?

Mr. SHERLEY. I am informed by the clerk that they have not come to the Committee on Appropriations and I have no knowledge that they ever have been certified.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is an addition to the large sums I have mentioned—\$33,000,000 authorized for the Medical Corps. That \$33,000,000 embraces a number of items—supplies, drugs, gas masks, motor ambulances, and various and sundry things. We gave an authorization because it was perfectly apparent from the financial statement made by the medical officers that they had on hand more money than they would actually expend between now and the 1st of July. But that money was obligated and was therefore held to meet obligations that would accrue from time to time, and unless they stopped the supplies—and this was particularly true as to the manufacture of gas masks—it was necessary that they be authorized, either by voting the cash or an authorization to continue the flow. The committee realized that the Military Affairs Committee would carry appropriations in the Army bill for this purpose and felt it was better to make the authorization than to give them the cash, due to the fact that if in the future it developed that the moneys that were given were not entirely needed they would be able to take care of the authorization without having the temptation of expending \$33,000,000 additional.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. MCKENZIE. I wish to ask the gentleman from Kentucky what effect this item will have on our appropriation bill?

Mr. SHERLEY. It will have simply this effect: The Military Affairs Committee will appropriate a good many times more than \$33,000,000, and they will take up this authorization out of those moneys, and if these moneys are not sufficient they will come for additional money. The gentleman need not worry; the Medical Corps, with all of its virtues, has not failed in modesty of requests touching appropriations.

Mr. MCKENZIE. That was one thing in my mind; I could not understand why they should come to the Appropriations Committee and ask an authorization of this character.

Mr. SHERLEY. To prevent laches. I will give the gentleman a concrete illustration. For instance, the Government is engaged in the manufacture of gas masks. Now, that manufacture must continue, and to continue many things must be ordered in advance. If they were to be denied, this money and have to wait until the 1st of July, that would leave a hiatus or stoppage in the flow of supplies and in the work carried on in the Government assembly plants and would greatly interfere with the manufacture of the gas masks at the rate they are seeking to furnish them.

Mr. MCKENZIE. If the Army appropriation bill had had the right of way in preference to this bill, there would have been no necessity for this authorization, would there?

Mr. SHERLEY. It would depend upon whether the items in the Army appropriation bill were immediately available. It would also depend upon whether there was an actual deficiency in these cases. Where there is an actual deficiency the Military Committee can not undertake within its jurisdiction to deal with it.

These, Mr. Chairman, constitute the large items that go to make up the total of \$123,000,000. There are a number of pieces of legislation proposed, all of it administrative in character, because the committee has very carefully refrained from attempting to usurp the jurisdiction of legislative committees by carrying legislation in the bill. They will be found set out, as is the uniform practice of the Committee on Appropriations, in the report submitted to the House, printed in italics, so that every Member of the House who wants to exercise ordinary diligence can advise himself in detail of any proposed legislation. They are found on pages 3 and 4 of the report.

There is a request of considerable size for additional personal service in the War Department. The committee has never in the past allowed the full amount asked by the War Department for additional personal help. It has felt that it was well to give to the War Department the need to constantly reexamine its estimates as to the need of additional service in order that there might be taken up the slack that is inevitable in a bureau that has had the great and sudden expansion that this has had. The committee is glad to say to the House that it believes that

there is a more keen appreciation and realization on the part of the War Department of the need of further carefully scrutinizing the demand in the way of additional clerks, and that steps have been taken and are now on the way for a careful inspection of the bureaus of that department looking to the elimination of unnecessary employees. The committee has met the situation by an appropriation which it believes is sufficient for the department to the 1st of July.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is the \$900,000 mentioned on page 6 of the bill to take care of deficiencies between now and the 1st of July?

Mr. SHERLEY. It is to carry their existing organizations to the 1st of July, and to allow not what they estimated for the increase between now and then, but for what the committee estimate ought to be the increase between now and then. Most of it is to take care of the existing personnel. The gentleman will also notice that there is a provision which limits to five people the number that can be employed under this fund at salaries as high as \$5,000 each. The department urged that the amount be placed at \$7,500, and that they be not limited as to the number, and the Secretary himself presented rather strong reasons in favor of that. In view of the well-known sentiment of the House the committee did not feel justified in going that far, but it did feel that it was warranted in permitting five men to be employed at not more than \$5,000 each. Mr. Chairman, this Government is faced with a realization that it either has to accept the voluntary services of men, and then be subject to all of the criticism that grows out of that practice, or it must pay real salaries to get real men of ability. In life you never get something for nothing, and particularly is that true of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I shall hope, in the consideration of the bill, to advise the committee touching any item that is in it respecting which inquiry may be made. In order not to delay its consideration I ask for the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

For carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to provide housing for war needs," approved May 16, 1918, including rental of offices in the District of Columbia, contingent and miscellaneous expenses, printing and binding, and personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, \$60,000,000, to continue available during the fiscal year 1919.

Section 7 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to provide housing for war needs," approved May 16, 1918, is amended to read as follows:

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question in respect to the housing proposition. Has the department adopted a plan to be worked out as a general proposition in providing houses by which they ask the people in the community to organize companies and subscribe a certain portion of money, and then the War Department through the General War Board or the Housing Commission, I believe they term it, will supply the remainder? For instance, if the local people supply 80 per cent, will the Housing Commission supply 20 per cent, or what is the plan of working out this housing proposition, if any plan has been adopted?

Mr. SHERLEY. I shall endeavor as briefly as I can to answer the gentleman's question, although there are 100 pages of testimony that were taken by the committee in an effort to get an answer to just such a question.

Mr. ROBBINS. I asked the question in good faith, because of applicants from my own district.

Mr. SHERLEY. I know that, and I am not quarreling with the gentleman at all. I am just explaining to him that it is a little difficult, as he will appreciate in a moment, to answer briefly his question. The proposed plan or plans will vary according to localities. There was originally created in the Council of National Defense a committee for the purpose of studying housing problems. Out of that committee afterwards grew the creation of a commission in the Department of Labor, of which Mr. Eidlitz is the head, and a number of other prominent gentlemen are associated with him to study this problem.

They undertook to make inquiries into those cases where either the War Department or the Navy Department said to them there was need for housing, and as to those cases where the communities themselves made similar statements and their statements were verified by the department, and then, after a survey, they have tentatively mapped out what they thought was necessary to do. They undertook in each instance to take a preliminary survey, which would determine whether it was possible to house the additional workmen that either had come or were going to those communities in houses already existing—

in other words, to see whether the community had reached what they phrased as the saturation point. They also undertook to determine whether it was possible to open up other localities as tributaries to such manufacturing establishments where the workmen were employed by improving methods of transportation. Failing in either of those methods and having by a survey of the men employed and to be employed come to the conclusion that there was need of additional housing, they then undertook, as far as possible, to get that housing provided by the voluntary action of citizens in the community, or the corporations affected, or by boards of trade, or other civic organizations.

They desire wherever it is practical to aid some organization of the community rather than to undertake directly Government building and Government ownership. In some cases they have been unable to get any sort of local aid. They suggested that they propose in a number of instances to loan 80 per cent of the cost of building a given number of houses, the loan to be made to a subsidiary corporation created for that purpose by the corporation employing the workmen for whom housing is sought. For instance, the Bethlehem Steel Co. might create a subsidiary corporation which would agree to furnish the land and 20 per cent of the cost of the building, and the Government would then furnish the additional 80 per cent, taking a first mortgage upon the houses so built, and in some instances with an agreement as a part of the terms of the loan that within a period of five years after the close of the war, there should be a valuation of the property to determine what it would cost to reproduce it as it was in the first instance, and to the extent that that represented a less sum than the actual cost, the mortgage should be reduced. In other words, the Government in such cases is assuming what might be called the war cost of building. If, for instance, 100 houses were constructed at \$3,000 each, and it was determined after the war upon a valuation that those houses could be constructed at the time of such valuation for \$2,800 each, there would be a wiping off of \$200 for each house upon the entire 100 houses, and to that extent the mortgage which had been taken by the Government would be considered satisfied. Touching the rest of it, there should be paid 5 per cent interest as the law passed by Congress provided, and at the termination of the period of the loan, the payment of the principal. That has been the plan proposed in a number of cases. In some other instances, particularly in connection with navy yards where the Government owns the establishment that needs to have the housing for its workmen, it has been proposed that the Government itself would build.

It developed in the hearing that the problem was largely one of permanent housing, not because of the desirability of housing permanently, but because of the character of the workmen who were to be supplied with houses. Temporary housing is practical for much unskilled labor and for a limited amount of skilled labor. Single men can to a limited degree be so taken care of, but for the skilled mechanics who have their families it is necessary to provide them something better than could be supplied through temporary barrack construction, and the difference between the two in cost would not be such as to warrant putting up simply temporary buildings. So while they have practically in every instance refused to agree to the full demand of the locality as to the number of houses to be built, their program looks in large measure to the building of permanent houses that can be sold, and are to be sold where the Government owns them, to workmen who will live in them and will expect actually to own them. Where the Government makes a loan and takes a mortgage the house will be of such a character and in such locality as to assure the return to the Government of the money that is loaned. At least that is both the hope and expressed belief of those gentlemen. Now, as I stated in other instances, they are undertaking by aiding in transportation to solve some of the problems. The gentleman will find on page 8 of the hearings a list of the cities where there have been requests for purchasing houses and where they have come to some conclusion as to the amount of money that they would probably expend at such places. On page 9 is a list of other cities that have made requests and where requests have not yet been acted upon. Now, it became early apparent in the hearings that it was impossible for the committee to designate in the allotment of moneys and by the character of houses as to how this money should be expended, but a reading of the hearings will clearly disclose, I think, that these men, who are experts in their respective lines, have given to the subject a degree of study that warrants the belief that as far as possible there will be a safeguarding of the Government's moneys. The committee examined into each program of building that had to any degree been determined on.



Mr. ROBBINS. That answers very fully the inquiry. I noticed page 8 and 9, and had read the list of places that applied, but no town I had in mind seems to have been included in this list. Butler, Pa., whose application was presented, on behalf of the board of trade with members of the board of trade, does not seem to be included, and Erie, Pa., which I was advised at the same time had been favorably acted on, does not seem to be included. This is only, however, an omission that is not fatal at all.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not recall either of those instances, but it is only fair to say the lists presented there are tentative. I think this ought to be said, and I say it without reference to the two instances that the gentleman cites, that there ought to be impressed through the membership of this House upon the communities of this country the very great duty that rests upon such communities to take care of this burden as far as it is possible; that they are not to assume that because the Government has seen fit to appropriate moneys for housing that it means thereby that it is to do all of the housing that needs to be done. The community that gets the benefit of great industrial activities on account of war orders, that has an expanse and a growth and a prosperity growing out of that, has a very definite pronounced patriotic obligation in turn to assume burdens that flow from those benefits, and not to look to the Treasury of the United States to house all the people who happen to come there.

Mr. ROBBINS. I think that was the same statement that was made to the Board of Trade of Butler, Pa., by the housing officials to whom they applied over in the city here, on F Street, I believe. I want to clear up the statement the gentleman made as to the depreciation charged off at the period of revaluation after the war for houses which were erected by the Government on the basis of 20 per cent advance by the Government and 80 per cent advance by the local community—

Mr. SHERLEY. It is the other way around; 80 per cent by the Government and 20 per cent by the local community, corporation, or individual.

Mr. ROBBINS. Is it the idea of the gentleman and of those who are interested in it in perfecting this housing proposition and its operation that that would be charged off as depreciation and credited to a Government mortgage, without any payment by the local people?

Mr. SHERLEY. The word "depreciation" is misleading. The idea is this: Building at this time is of necessity more expensive than at any other time—

Mr. ROBBINS. We appreciate that very much.

Mr. SHERLEY. And because it is more expensive to-day, private interests hesitate to undertake it. Now, if they are to be charged with the entire cost of building, the only thing that they get in the way of inducement is the loan at 5 per cent that the Government makes. They have insisted—and I am simply stating their case now, without necessarily meaning to say it meets my approbation—they have insisted that inasmuch as they have to build at a time when there is an excess of anywhere from 30 to 50 per cent in building cost, they should be permitted to pay back as of the value of that property if built in normal times, and they give to the Government the option to have an appraisal made at any time within five years after the close of the war. Now, that appraisal is not for the purpose of determining the value of the houses when appraised, but it is to determine what it would cost to erect at this time new houses exactly like those were when new.

Mr. ROBBINS. Protect them against the excessive cost?

Mr. SHERLEY. That is the purpose of such provisions.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Is it the purpose to deduct from this \$60,000,000 for housing money to establish electric-light plants, pave streets, and establish water companies?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think with perhaps the one exception of a proposed plan down near Portsmouth none of the items discussed were items where it was proposed to build houses outside of existing municipalities. In no instance was it proposed to create municipal facilities other than the suggestion touching some property outside of Portsmouth.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I have in mind the shipping plant at Bristol. They are spending there about \$5,000,000. They are opening a great many streets; they are placing a sewerage system in the streets, installing electric lights and water pipes, and paving the streets, and expending a great deal of money. Would that come out of the \$60,000,000?

Mr. SHERLEY. That is a case where the moneys come from the moneys furnished the Shipping Board and the Fleet Corporation, and it is pursuant to an act that was passed some months ago authorizing the Emergency Fleet Corporation or the Shipping Board to expend up to \$50,000,000 for housing purposes.

Now, I suspect, without recalling the details, though we had some testimony by the Shipping Board in the sundry civil bill as to Bristol, that this is the situation, namely, that they found that as a business proposition it was better to take certain lands that could be obtained in sufficient quantity at a reasonable rate; and they are building these houses and opening up the streets with a view of subsequent sale of the houses, rather than to undertake to buy expensive land that might not be as suitable for the purpose. And it might be quite possible, as the gentleman says, and I have no doubt it is, that in that instance they are opening up new streets.

Now, there is another question in that connection, and that is one of the reasons why, in my judgment, it is desirable to authorize in this bill the creation of a corporation. If the Government buys these lots and erects the buildings on them, the property ceases to be taxable for either municipal, county, or State purposes; and, of course, it is not to be expected that if you take out of a community certain of its taxable assets the community will of its own accord furnish municipal facilities. And in the hearings it was suggested that one of the things that was desirable to do, instead of having the Government go into the creation of municipalities, was to enter into agreements with existing municipalities, where it was practicable, for the extension of their sewerage and water and lighting and streets and fire and police facilities in consideration of having added property that would be sufficiently valuable for taxation to give a return for the facilities given.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES].

Mr. MAPES. Has the President authorized the organization headed by Mr. Eidlitz, that was created by the Secretary of Labor, to go ahead with this housing proposition?

Mr. SHERLEY. At the time of the hearing he had not formally done so, but I have no doubt of his determination to use these gentlemen in the carrying out of this act. I say that because of the fact that in connection with some of these preliminary surveys and work that they have been doing, and which ought to have been done, and had to be done, if the situation was to be met, he has advanced out of the fund that Congress placed at his disposal a limited amount of money, I think something like \$60,000. So I have no doubt he will use this existing organization.

Mr. MAPES. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not any conclusion has been reached as to how these houses that are to be built by the Government are to be furnished?

Mr. SHERLEY. They are not to be furnished by the Government at all. They are to be rented unfurnished; that is, outside of those in the District of Columbia, where they do expect to furnish them, and have dormitories composed of several hundred rooms, each room to house a single person.

Mr. MAPES. It will be necessary to furnish those, will it not?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAPES. And is that the settled policy of the organization?

Mr. SHERLEY. I gathered that that was their policy. The testimony showed that they did not contemplate the furnishing of any of these houses that are to be built elsewhere. And, as I stated a few minutes ago, it was their desire not to build these in any instance except as a final resort.

Mr. MAPES. My inquiry was directed more especially to the housing facilities to be put up here in the District.

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, in the District there are some proposals looking to the building on four sites here of dormitories, probably exclusively for women. The dormitories will house different numbers, according to the area available, divided into rooms that will be occupied by one person and which will be simply furnished and to have in connection with such dormitories a restaurant, the facilities of which will probably be given—and when I say "given" I do not mean in the sense of a gratuity—to some concessionaire, who will run the restaurant.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for another question on another matter?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. SNELL. Is there any provision in the \$11,000,000 for training camps, for any training camps outside of those connected with the regular cantonments?

Mr. SHERLEY. The \$11,000,000 for training camps was for training camps for any training camps outside of those committee had no opportunity to express an opinion in regard to their wisdom or their unwisdom. It developed that the Secretary of the Navy had taken the responsibility of ordering this work done, and there was \$11,000,000 to be met, and there was nothing for the committee to do but to meet it.

Now, the gentleman will find on page 141 of the hearings a statement setting out the training camps and the estimates as to the expenditures at the various camps. They are all existing camps, and the amount which is to be expended or which has been expended is set out there. The gentleman will see that \$7,650,000 is on camps where the work has been let and is under way; \$950,000 is at camps where the work has been let but is not under way; and \$2,400,000 is where authority has been given but where there has been no actual contract made.

Mr. SNELL. But there is nothing in this that provides for any additional camps?

Mr. SHERLEY. No, sir. The gentleman will find the details set out there. The committee has had no option. It is manifest that it is impossible for the committee, I will say to the gentleman, to ascertain how extensive the building should be and whether it is being done economically or not. The clerk reminds me that it did develop in the testimony that there were projects that had not been approved by the Navy looking to an expenditure of \$4,000,000, but they are not involved in the amounts that are carried in this bill.

Mr. SNELL. Can the gentleman tell from what fund the nitrate plants Nos. 2 and 3, that have been decided upon, come—Nos. 2 and 3, down at Muscle Shoals?

Mr. SHERLEY. My subcommittee has had no hearing on that. The subcommittee on fortifications is having a hearing at this time on that and other matters in connection with the fortification bill. My understanding is that a very large part of the fund was obtained from the money appropriated in one of the deficiency bills last year in connection with the purchase, manufacture, and test of ammunition for mountain, field, and siege cannon; it was held that the language "manufacture and test" made available such portions of that fund as were necessary in connection with the manufacture of ammunition.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman says the fortifications subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations is considering that at the present time?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes. They are having hearings in connection with the estimates for the coming year, and, as always has been the practice of the Committee on Appropriations, they endeavor in connection with new estimates to make inquiry into the expenditures that have been made under similar items heretofore; and I happen to know—because I have talked the matter over with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND]—that this particular matter will be inquired into. I personally am not familiar with the testimony that has been given over the last several days.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The entire amount of the plant No. 2 at Muscle Shoals was taken from the item that the gentleman refers to. Does the gentleman know what item is being used for the construction of those two new nitrate plants?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not; but I presume the same thing would apply as to them. There was also an appropriation of \$20,000,000 in the national defense act. Just how much of it has been used, or will be used, I do not know; but I think the gentleman will admit before he is through the inquiry—and I have no objection to the inquiry—that, assuming the necessity for a greatly increased capacity in this country for the making of various forms of explosives—

Mr. LONGWORTH. I think there is no question but that it is necessary—

Mr. SHERLEY. In a moment—and assuming the need for the creation of additional sources for the supply of nitrate as an incident to the manufacture of such explosives, that the department would have been derelict in duty if it had not undertaken to supply the deficiency in those particulars as early as possible. Now, by that I do not mean to say that the method pursued has been wise or unwise, though I do not think that the statements heretofore made have warranted the assumption that some gentlemen have indulged in, that the whole matter was indefensible and without excuse.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not think that anybody has denied the necessity for getting a larger supply of nitrate, but the gentleman must agree to this, that that appropriation when made was intended for objects other than the building of nitrate plants, and therefore if a large amount, some hundreds of millions, is taken out of that item—

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not agree to anything of the sort. I do not come close to it. I will tell you what I do agree to, and that is that the practice in the past has been—and by that I mean before the war—that whenever a department had in contemplation the creation of some factory or facility for manufacture that involved a sum at all large, instead of undertaking to get it out of the funds carried for guns or ammunition generally, they came to Congress and specifically asked for it. That is the way we created our various arsenals. But it does not follow that, because that was the practice in the past, there may not have existed conditions that warranted them in using this money for this purpose; and it does not follow, as implied in the question of the gentleman from Ohio, that such use means a diversion of funds, and that it results in a less sum being available for ammunition purposes. Just the contrary may be true. It does not necessarily matter in the way of quantity production of ammunition whether that money is expended in buying the finished product, whether all of it was so expended or part of it expended in getting those things that go to make the finished product.

Mr. SNELL. Does the money for the establishment of the water power come out of the same fund as that in connection with the building of the plant?

Mr. SHERLEY. My only knowledge on that point is derived from some statements made by the gentleman from Ohio, which I neither question or confirm.

Mr. LONGWORTH. My information came from the Secretary of War, and I can tell the gentleman that Dam No. 2 at Muscle Shoals is being built with moneys taken from the \$20,000,000 nitrate fund, and the money for the erection of the plant itself is being taken from this appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for another minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERLEY. We can best get at this matter when it comes before the House in a regular way and when all of us will have all of the information that is available on the subject.

Mr. SNELL. When will that come?

Mr. SHERLEY. That will come under the fortifications bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The President, if in his judgment such action is deemed necessary or advantageous, may authorize the creation of a corporation or corporations for the purpose of carrying out the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to provide housing for war needs," approved May 16, 1918, such corporation or corporations to have or obtain all powers necessary or appropriate therefor. The total capital stock of the corporation or corporations authorized hereunder shall not exceed \$60,000,000: *Provided*, That where such corporation or corporations are created by authority of the President, representatives appointed by the President, or by such agency as he may designate to carry out the purposes of the said act, shall subscribe to, own, and vote the capital stock thereof for and on behalf of the United States, and shall do all other things in regard thereto necessary to protect the interests of the United States and to carry out the provisions of the said act: *Provided further*, That section 605 of the Code of the District of Columbia prohibiting a corporation from buying, selling, or dealing in real estate shall not apply to such corporation or corporations so created or designated, with respect to buying, selling, or dealing in real estate in furtherance of the provisions of the said act: *Provided further*, That the act entitled "An act to amend section 552 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia, relating to incorporations," approved February 4, 1905, shall not apply to any corporation or corporations created under the authority contained in this paragraph.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of stating a fact that recently has come to my knowledge and which does not affect the legislation here, because it is nothing which Congress can affect one way or the other. It is a matter entirely within the executive action of the departments and bureaus. That is the competition here in Washington between the different bureaus and agencies of the Government, which I hope will not affect the building of these houses. I was told recently of one department where the men who were working were drawn out of their employment to another department because they were working 8 hours and the other department offered them the opportunity to work 10 hours, and, of course, for the two extra hours they would receive overtime. Therefore it was more attractive to them than where they were working. So they were drawn away from where they were doing good work to another department which, perhaps, needed them less. I do not believe that the question as to which needed them most was at all taken into consideration in their final apportionment.

I heard of another case where bricklayers who were working in one department here in Washington at \$6 a day were offered \$8 a day here by another department, and so they were taken away from the place where they were probably quite satisfied



and doing good work at \$6 a day to the other department paying them \$8 a day. Now, which department needed them most I do not know. If there was any assurance that they finally were landed in the place where they could do the most good to the Government, it would lessen my criticism.

Mr. SNYDER. Were the men who offered them the higher wages working on a contract?

Mr. GILLET. No; these were both strictly Government departments or bureaus or agencies. I do not care to be specific and say who they were, because I do not wish to criticize any department; but it simply illustrates a condition which exists. I hope the Department of Labor, which is to engage in this housing business, will not follow the practice which other departments are now apparently following, of bidding against some other department, thereby constantly enhancing wages and increasing the cost to the Government, and worst of all not insuring that the department which needs them most finally gets them. There ought to be, and I suppose there is, on paper an organization to accomplish the object that there shall not be this competition among the departments, and that some one shall have supreme jurisdiction where a man shall go. But as these facts were brought to my attention I thought I would bring them to the attention of the authorities in this way, hoping that the abuse which apparently exists in Washington will not be increased by this very large addition to the employment of labor.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the temporary employment of such additional force of clerks and other employees as in the judgment of the Secretary of War may be proper and necessary to the prompt, efficient, and accurate dispatch of official business in the War Department and its bureaus, to be allotted by the Secretary of War to such bureaus and offices as the exigencies of the existing situation may demand, \$900,000; *Provided*, That the Secretary of War shall submit to Congress on the first day of its next regular session a statement showing by bureaus or offices the number and designation of the persons employed hereunder and the annual rate of compensation paid to each; *Provided further*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation in excess of \$5,000 per annum, not more than 5 persons shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation in excess of \$2,400 per annum each, and not more than 35 persons shall be employed at a rate of compensation in excess of \$1,800 per annum each.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, who is the clerk that is to be employed at \$5,000 a year in the War Department? At page 6, line 12, there is a provision for one clerk in the War Department to be employed at \$5,000 a year.

Mr. SHERLEY. No clerk.

Mr. KAHN. What is the \$5,000 salary for?

Mr. SHERLEY. It is for those high-grade people whom the Secretary of War personally stated that he needed in connection with a lot of work that was going on in the department, among other things the systematizing of contracts. The gentleman will note that the paragraph relates to the temporary employment of such additional force of clerks and other employees as in the judgment of the Secretary of War may be proper and necessary.

I stated awhile ago, during the gentleman's absence, that the Secretary said he had but one of three methods that he knew of available to him for a certain character of work—either to accept the services of men who volunteered, with all the evils that have been so frequently pointed out on this floor, or the employment of men at salaries sufficient to get men of real competence, or turning over of important work to men who were simply clerks and not competent, or giving men commissions, with such high rank as would give them commensurate salaries, and which he thought was a very indefensible method. He urged very strongly upon the committee that we allow appointments at a rate as high as \$7,500 a year, and without any other limitation than that he should personally make the appointment and certify the reason for it. The committee, having in mind somewhat the attitude of this House in the past, reached the conclusion that the allowance of five salaries not exceeding \$5,000 would probably enable him to meet the situation, and it accordingly fixed that limitation.

Mr. KAHN. I have no objection to giving to the Secretary of War all the assistance that he needs—

Mr. SHERLEY. The proposition was simply this, and I am sure the gentleman will agree with it. It is perfectly apparent that in this day, with the tremendous expansion of that department, there is great need of a limited number of high-grade men. Now, you can get those men either by having them volunteer, or by paying them a salary, or by commissioning them, and I think the payment of a salary is a legitimate, dignified way for the Government to do it.

Mr. KAHN. I agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For Medical and Hospital Department, including the same objects specified under this head in the Army appropriation act for the fiscal year 1918 and in the deficiency appropriation act approved October 6, 1917, the Secretary of War is authorized to enter into contracts and otherwise to incur obligations not to exceed \$33,000,000 in addition to the appropriations heretofore made.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I should like to have information about that item.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will give it again. I am sorry the gentleman was not here when I made the explanation a few minutes ago. I shall be glad to make it again.

The gentleman will find by looking at the hearings that the Medical Department came in with a statement showing the expenditures that they had made under the appropriations that had been given to them heretofore of \$130,800,000; and they showed that there was in the way of expenditures and obligations an indebtedness that more than took up that amount of money, and that they needed, under additional obligations or appropriations, for motor vehicles, \$2,985,000; replacements and repairs, \$1,040,000; printing and binding, \$100,000; veterinary supplies, medicines, and antiseptics, \$260,019; dressings, \$142,824.12; instruments, \$67,272.92; horse blankets, \$245,000; gas masks, \$11,000,000; employees and operatives, \$1,257,000. Other medical and hospital supplies: Medicines, antiseptics, and disinfectants, \$5,000,000; surgical dressings and sutures, \$14,000,000; hospital equipment and supplies, \$1,600,000; textiles, \$6,000,000; instruments and appliances, \$900,000; litters, pack saddles, and field chests, \$500,000; making a total of \$45,316,116.04.

Then they had an expense of civilian employees, that is out in the field, of \$1,315,000; laundry hospital linen, \$400,000; civilian medical service, \$500,000; expressage on medical property, \$4,000; gas and electricity and laboratory apparatus, \$4,000; miscellaneous, \$6,000; allowance to disbursing officers in Europe for which no accountability will be made to the Surgeon General, \$3,600; making a total of \$51,145,116.04.

At the time this statement was made they had \$18,233,305.35 unobligated, which left \$33,000,000, the amount we are carrying here. At the time the hearing was had, which was later than the time the table was made up, there were a number of items that had changed the \$18,000,000, which, as I said a moment ago, had been all obligated, but the table I have read gives you the situation, after four or five hours of hard work with the Medical Corps.

The Clerk read as follows:

For fuel, lights, repairs, miscellaneous items, and printing for the fiscal years that follow:

Nineteen hundred and eighteen, \$45,150.

Nineteen hundred and nineteen, \$147,500.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Does the Government manufacture its own electricity for all these new buildings?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think in all new temporary buildings it buys it. It was stated that they were buying at a rate which was as cheap as they could make it. I do not think that applies generally to permanent buildings. Eight or ten years ago I had occasion to go into the cost of making electricity in the District of Columbia when they had a proposition to sell us electricity at a price which ran all the way from 10 cents down to 3 cents, and 3 cents was extravagant. In connection with these particular buildings I think we are getting it as cheaply as we could make it.

Mr. SNELL. Does the gentleman know what the rate is?

Mr. SHERLEY. It is a sliding scale, making it considerably under 3 cents, but I do not remember accurately the rate.

The Clerk read as follows:

War and Navy Department temporary office buildings (Potomac Park): For the following employees from August 15, 1918, to June 30, 1919, inclusive, at annual rates of compensation as follows: Assistant superintendent, \$2,000; clerks—1 of class 4, 2 of class 3, 2 of class 2, 4 of class 1, 4 at \$1,000 each; 4 messengers, at \$720 each; chief engineer, \$1,800; assistant engineers—1 \$1,600, 6 at \$1,400 each; chief electrician, \$1,600; electricians—4 at \$1,400 each, 4 at \$1,200 each; foreman, \$1,600; carpenters—3 at \$1,400 each, 7 at \$1,200 each; sign writer, \$1,400; painters—3 at \$1,200 each, 2 at \$1,000 each; plumbers—1 \$1,400, 4 at \$1,200 each; steam fitters—2 at \$1,400 each, 2 at \$1,200 each; machinist, \$1,400; 4 switchboard operators, at \$1,200 each; 6 general mechanics, at \$1,000 each; guards—captain \$1,600, 6 lieutenants at \$1,080 each, 8 sergeants at \$930 each, 205 at \$780 each, 80 at \$720 each; fire marshal, \$1,080; foreman of laborers, \$1,000; 2 assistant foremen of laborers, at \$840 each; 83 laborers, at \$660 each; 22 female laborers, at \$480 each; 8 forewomen of charwomen, at \$300 each; 208 charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$388,955.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. On page 10, line 4, there is a provision for a sign writer at \$1,400. What is a sign writer?

Mr. SHERLEY. In this instance he is a painter who paints the signs for all the doors and hallways to help people find the offices and to indicate who are in the offices.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Is he employed continuously every day writing signs?

Mr. SHERLEY. He is employed continuously, and when not painting signs he is doing general painting work around the place.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. He does other work besides painting signs?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

War Department temporary office building (Eighteenth Street and Virginia Avenue NW.): For the following employees from July 1, 1918, to June 30, 1919, inclusive, at annual rates of compensation, as follows: Assistant superintendent, \$1,800; clerk of class 1; chief engineer, \$1,400; assistant engineer, \$1,000; 6 firemen at \$840 each; 4 coal passers at \$720 each; electrician, \$1,200; carpenter, \$1,200; painter, \$1,000; general mechanic, \$1,000; guards—captain \$1,200, 3 sergeants at \$930 each, 42 privates at \$780 each; foreman of laborers, \$840; 10 laborers at \$660 each; 3 female laborers at \$480 each; 2 forewomen of charwomen at \$300 each; 18 charwomen at \$240 each; in all, \$68,270.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill a question. On page 9, line 25, I see there is an assistant superintendent at \$2,000, and on page 10, line 25, an assistant superintendent at \$1,800. Why is it not proper to reduce the one who draws \$2,000, on page 9, in the Navy Department to \$1,800, who seems to perform the same duties and hold the same office as the other and known by the same name? Why the difference?

Mr. SHERLEY. They have the same name but do not do the same amount of work. One of them is in charge of buildings very much larger than the other. The committee took the statement of Col. Ridley, who has charge of the matter and knows what these people ought to be paid. In these two instances he testified he was having great difficulty in getting men at all fitted to attend to the jobs at the salaries ordinarily paid. All the gentleman needs to do is to recall what unskilled laborers are getting to-day to realize that that is true because these men are not getting a permanent Government position, at least I hope they are not. These buildings will pass away in the course of a few years. Anyway that particular difference was at the instance of Col. Ridley, who said that the work they had to do warranted the difference in the salary.

Mr. ROBBINS. I want to say that I have been through these buildings somewhat, and so far as my observations go they are filled with clerks that are not employed. They are not busy. The service down there looks to me as if it was very indifferently and inefficiently rendered. Now, I want to be understood; I do not mean to say that those who are working are not performing their duty but they do not all work. On one occasion as I walked through the buildings at Seventh and B Streets I observed a great many idlers. As I and my friend went through one long room we counted seven girls and four boys sitting at a desk talking in one room. We took occasion to pass back through the same room 5 or 10 minutes afterwards and they were doing the same thing. Now, I have no objection to paying one of these men \$1,800 and the other \$2,000, for I accept the gentleman's explanation in this instance, but I wanted to make the other observation which struck me at the time, that if these two men are in charge of the buildings there, they ought to see that the people employed there work.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, he is laboring under a misapprehension as to what this force is for. This force has nothing to do with the clerical force of which he is speaking. This force is there for the purpose of attending to the heat, light, cleaning, and protection of the building. Touching the other matter, I want to say this: I have taken occasion—not once, not twice, not six times, but a dozen times—to call the attention of the various responsible officers of the Government to statements that have been made upon the floor and off the floor similar to what the gentleman has just said. I think—I know—that some of that criticism has been warranted by the facts. It is fair to say that there are times, of necessity, when a bureau is undergoing expansion, when there will be some slack that can not be immediately taken up, but that does not explain what has been a condition in the past. Some of it has been due to the very great incompetency of some of the clerical service that we get here, and if the Civil Service Commission would get a more intelligent examination, I think we would get a better class of clerks. We might not get quite so many school-teachers, but we might get more people who know about clerical duties. I want to say in justification of the department that an officer has recently been detailed upon this very matter, and I had occasion to talk to him—in point of fact, he sought me out as a result of some criticisms that I had made—and I have reason to believe that he and other people are going to correct and are correcting now some of the abuses of which the gentleman complains. When the sundry civil bill hearings come out the gentleman will find page after

page of inquiry of various people in connection with just that question. You are usually met with the statement that they do not know of the incidents of which they complain. I suggest to Members of Congress—and it is not a pleasant duty, and there are a lot of things that are not pleasant these days—that instead of coming on the floor and making a general assertion, they come with the concrete case, when they see a case of that kind, and take the time to make some inquiry and find out who the clerk is and who is the man responsible for the clerk, so that we can put our finger on the people and get results. There are 15,000 temporary employees now in the War Department. It is impossible to indict every one and get anywhere, but if gentlemen will bring specific cases we will be glad to aid them in getting at the responsible people.

Mr. ROBBINS. I want to call the gentleman's attention in that connection to another incident that occurred to me, subject perhaps to his suggestion that I ought to be specific and get the names and places and the officers in charge. On Friday last, about half past 10 o'clock in the morning, I came along by those buildings at Seventh and B Streets. I had been in the one located farthest south on business. I found the whole street filled with clerks. It was not the noon hour. It was about half past 10 o'clock in the morning, but it looked like the Atlantic City boardwalk, and the gentleman who was with me made the same comment and wondered how it was that all those clerks were out. Boys and girls would walk up to the corner, buying ice-cream cones and going over to the fruit stand across the street, and seemed to be out for a holiday rather than working for our Government in war time. Does the gentleman know the explanation for that unusual condition of affairs?

Mr. SHERLEY. I expect the explanation is this: In certain departments the clerks are at work longer than seven hours, some perhaps working longer than eight hours, and they are being given 10-minute rest periods, I think, twice a day, in addition to the lunch hour. In other words, they come to work at an earlier hour and stay later, and it has been deemed advisable by the officers having them in charge to give them certain rest periods, and I am not prepared to say that that may not be wise administration, assuming that it does not mean actual curtailing of the work but simply means longer time down there, with rest periods so as to prevent the fog and the fatigue that slows down work. I think that is the explanation of the incident of which the gentleman speaks.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an inquiry with reference to these appropriations for these different employees?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. Will they be eligible for the horizontal increase that has been given other Government employees?

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman means the \$120 increase?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. That matter is in conference between the House and the Senate. It depends upon what comes out of conference. The Senate raised the amount and undertook to restrict it so as not to have it apply to new bureaus that have been created since July, 1916. The House provision did not so restrict it as to bureaus, but did restrict it to a lesser sum.

Mr. WALSH. I had forgotten for the moment that that matter had not been definitely acted upon; but if that is adopted, it depends upon the form in which it is finally enacted?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; but in these instances it would not affect these people, because this is not a new establishment but is an expanded old one.

The Clerk read as follows:

The char force of the foregoing temporary office buildings and the temporary office buildings in Henry Park, which is employed and paid by the bureaus or offices occupying the said buildings, shall be subject to the supervision and control of the superintendent of the State, War, and Navy Department Building.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The reason for that provision is this: There developed a rather curious situation growing out of an old division of authority, that had a reason, in old buildings. The superintendent of these buildings had charge of the charwomen engaged in cleaning the corridors, but had nothing to do with the cleaning of the space that was occupied by the offices. That was perfectly understandable in a building like the State, War, and Navy Building, which is divided into many rooms, but in a great number of these new buildings there are no rooms in the sense of rooms apart from the corridors. The corridor consists simply of a path through the middle of one big room, with a rail on either side, and it was absurd to have two different forces of charwomen under two different managements taking care of that space, and this is to correct that situation.



The Clerk read as follows:

Transportation of remains: For transportation of remains, including the same objects specified under this head in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1918, \$300,000.

Mr. ROBBINS. In reference to the item of \$300,000 I wish to ask the gentleman, and I do not wish to elicit any information that will be very dismal or improper to obtain, but I had a constituent killed in battle on the French front, and upon request for the return of his remains, at the instance of his father in this case, I was advised that no returns would be made until the close of the war. If that be true, what is the necessity for this item? Is there an explanation? I do not care to go into it in detail or to make any inquiry that would disclose anything improper at all, but the item seems rather unusual.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, this relates to the Navy and not to the Army. The Navy are bringing home a certain number of men who die on ships in foreign waters, and it also is used for the purpose of transporting the remains of men in the service here in America who die either aboard ship or ashore. The Navy has undergone a very large expansion, and we have felt that while we did not know that they would need this amount of money that they might need it, and the committee naturally did not want to refuse any money for such purpose.

Mr. ROBBINS. I understand that; I just wanted to inquire. The Clerk read as follows:

#### COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

For office expenses, including the same objects specified under this head in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1918, \$8,000.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I do not know anything as to the necessity of this item for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and I do not want particularly to take part in the discussion as to whether clerks in Washington are, generally speaking, working, or, generally speaking, loafing. So far as my observation goes, they are working; but I do believe there is a whole lot of Government work being done here in Washington and elsewhere which has nothing whatever to do with the winning of this war, work that might as well be postponed now as not, and that the force of clerks so employed ought to be transferred to the War Department or the Navy Department or to some other department which is essential to the winning of the war. The Provost Marshal General has recently classified certain industries as nonessential and has said that men, even those who are married, who are holding certain positions in hotels and in other places must seek other work or fight. Now, there are lots of men from my observation doing Government work which is non-essential and who ought to seek other work or be forced to fight. On the 9th day of May I introduced the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That the Bureau of Efficiency be directed to report to the House of Representatives what Government activities in Washington or elsewhere are not essential to the successful prosecution of the war, and also what Government activities could be curtailed during the war so that their clerical forces could be transferred in part to essential war activities.

That resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, for what reason I do not know. I shall ask the Committee on Military Affairs, now that they have their big bill off their hands, to take some action on it or I shall ask a reference of it.

It probably ought to be referred to some other committee. We certainly ought to have some light on this subject. We passed the Overman bill week before last giving the President full authority to reorganize and transfer men from one department to another, but President Wilson, I think, in all fairness may be said not to be given to drastic action. He does not like to chop off men's heads and throw people out of one place and put them in another if he can help it, but somebody ought to make a study and report on these matters, roughly at least, and let us know, let Congress know, and let the President know what activities could be postponed during the war or what should be curtailed. A great flood of people has been coming to Washington to do war work, congesting all living accommodations and causing unnecessary expense, when there are other people here who might be doing the war work instead of the work they are now doing.

Mr. ROBBINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. I will.

Mr. ROBBINS. Does not the gentleman think in the line of his suggestion that the great army of clerks over here in the Interstate Commerce Building valuing railroads could be taken off that job during the war and turned to something else, especially since the Government has taken over the roads?

Mr. PLATT. I do. I think that valuation work is an absolutely idiotic thing to do at this time. They are employing a lot of engineers that ought to be doing Army work. There is not a

man employed in that work to-day who feels proud of his work, and several of them have told me so. The engineers who are employed will tell you they are not doing anything worth while. It is an outrage to continue work of that kind when everybody employed in it knows it is not useful at this time, if at any time, and when there is such a tremendous demand for engineers and for competent clerks in war work.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, with the gentleman's general observation I am in accord; as to the illustration used to enforce it I am not. It so happens that the \$8,000 is for the purpose of supplying charts for the Navy and Shipping Board, and is more essential now than ever before in its existence—

Mr. PLATT. I fully agree to that.

Mr. SHERLEY. And it was carried for that purpose. I do not agree with the gentleman especially touching the valuing of the railroads, because there is going to be a very great need of that sort of information to protect this Government from the expenditure of a great many millions of dollars in the near future. Whatever may have been the need in the past for doing it, the need has grown, and to stop work now would be to throw away all that is behind us and put ourselves at the mercy of the railroads if we should take them over or if any issue comes as to compensation for them incident to our present occupancy. I want to say I do thoroughly share with the gentleman his general indictment of many of the departments of the Government.

One of the melancholy things in connection with this war is that everybody is willing to tack onto a war need his particular activity, whether there be any legitimate reason in peace or otherwise for its existence, and one of the chief difficulties the Committee on Appropriations has is in trying to force that idea into the heads of men who do not want to see it, even when they do see it. I think the President has the power—and I think he has the desire—to eliminate some of the unnecessary activities that go on, but the ingenuity of men in explaining why the other fellow's job is unnecessary, but that theirs is important, passes all belief. Somehow or other, both in this present emergency and every other that this country has ever faced, it has been exceedingly difficult to divorce any governmental employee from his job. Some of the real achievements of my career in 16 years have consisted in abolishing a few commissions.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Kentucky yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will.

Mr. ANTHONY. I wanted to ask the gentleman what particular item in this bill has to do with picric-acid plants which I see the Government is contemplating establishing. What appropriation do they come out of?

Mr. SHERLEY. They do not come out of any in this bill. During the gentleman's absence that matter was discussed considerably. I will say to the gentleman what I said to others, in connection with the hearings on the fortifications bill, it is hoped the committee may be prepared to present to the House as much information as possible relative to the development of these various plants.

However, I was mistaken a moment ago. I was thinking of nitrates. The gentleman is speaking of—

Mr. ANTHONY. Picric acid.

Mr. SHERLEY. All I know about that is what I saw in the newspapers the other day, that one plant had been located at Little Rock.

Mr. ANTHONY. And one at Brunswick, Ga. I wondered what appropriation from the gentleman's committee they come out of.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am unable to answer, but it is quite possible that they come from the fund that is available for the manufacture of ammunition.

Mr. ANTHONY. Does the gentleman know if there is any particular reason for their location at Brunswick or Little Rock? Are there raw materials there?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will say to the gentleman that some time ago a gentleman came to me from my city and said that the city was very anxious to have located a plant at Louisville. I did not give him any help in the matter, not because I did not want to see my city obtain new industries, but since this war I have made it a rule to make no recommendation at all concerning any contractual relation between individuals or localities and the Government. I do not think a man in my position in the House should make such a request, however much he might desire it. All I know is that the gentleman came to me subsequently and said Louisville had lost out and that Little Rock had been chosen.

Mr. ANTHONY. I wondered what appropriation those two plants would come out of.

The Clerk read as follows:

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

For stationery for Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners, including \$1,000 for stationery for the use of the committees and officers of the House, \$1,625.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I do this for the purpose of asking the gentleman to recur to page 14 and to the item headed "Public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks," and including—

repairs and preservation at navy yards and stations: For repairs and preservation at navy yards, fuel depots, fuel plants, and stations, \$2,100,000.

Will the gentleman kindly state whether the Navy is now accumulating coal at fuel depots and whether this contemplates the erection of new ones? I am asking this now out of order, because I was obliged to leave the Hall for a while.

Mr. SHERLEY. That did not develop in the hearings at all, and this deficiency had nothing to do with that matter. It is a repair item and simply relates to general repairs and preservation at navy yards.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It does not contemplate new fuel stations?

Mr. SHERLEY. It is a repair item entirely, and the hearings did not in any sense develop anything relative to such statement.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I notice there is a great deal of discussion as to the necessity for buying coal early and putting it away now for next winter, so far as domestic use is concerned, and coal seems to be piling up at a great many Army stations and navy yards. I wondered if any precautions were being taken on that line now?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not know that. I hope to present to the House a bill looking to the establishment of a yard here in the District of Columbia to take care of the Government needs for coal. It would save a lot of money and take us out from under the control of the coal dealers.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is a local question and is pertinent, but this matter of fuel depots does not contemplate the erection of new ones for the Navy, so far as the gentleman knows?

Mr. SHERLEY. I simply say that this item has nothing to do with that one way or the other. I do not know what is being done.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have the Clerk correct the totals of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Houston, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12280) making appropriations to supply additional urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SHERLEY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. CALDWELL. To ask unanimous consent that I may be given the privilege of extending my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of ordnance and also on the transportation of the Army.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subjects indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman, I understand, has stricken out certain matter in his speech to which I called attention the other day?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I do not object.

There was no objection.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, before making the motion to adjourn, I want to say that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] intends to call up the military bill to-morrow. And we will adjourn over for Memorial Day. I would like to ask unanimous consent to dispense with the business in order on next Calendar Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to dispense on Wednesday with the business in order on Calendar Wednesday. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## ADJOURNMENT FROM WEDNESDAY UNTIL FRIDAY.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House, when it adjourns next Wednesday, may adjourn to meet on Friday at 12 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the House, when it adjourns next Wednesday, adjourn to meet next Friday. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## PRINTING COPIES OF THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask unanimous consent that the number of copies that can be printed within the \$500 limit, without resolution, of the President's message, delivered to-day, be printed and placed in the document room.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that as many copies of the President's message, delivered to-day, as can be printed under the limit of \$500 be printed and placed in the document room. Is there objection?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, would it not be better to place them in the folding room?

Mr. GARNER. I have no objection, if you want them to go to the folding room. Many Members will not use them, but they would be given away.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I suggest that they go to the folding room.

Mr. GARNER. Very well; I have no objection to that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill and joint resolution of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 279. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in certain cases to missionary or religious organizations; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to extend the time for the payment of annual installments on the purchase price for land in the Standing Rock Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

## REVISION OF REMARKS.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to revise my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks leave to revise his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to make a unanimous-consent request, the first I have made since I have been in Congress, and I hope it will be granted. I ask unanimous consent that to-morrow, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that to-morrow, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, he be permitted to address the House, not to exceed 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 28, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting list of places for which authorization for public-building work



is recommended (H. Doc. No. 1134); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of War submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation desired by the Quartermaster Corps of the Army to increase the pay of the superintendent of the national cemetery at Mexico City, Mexico (H. Doc. No. 1135); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of War submitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Engineer Department of the Army for the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1136); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky (by request): A bill (H. R. 12294) to provide for the redistribution of general taxes and special assessments due and payable on real estate in the District of Columbia in cases of subdivisions or sales of land therein; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 12295) for the relief of the Ottawa Indian Tribe of Blanchard Fork and Roche de Boeuf; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12296) for the relief of the heirs of the Eastern Cherokee Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12297) granting an increase of pension to Willis J. Gambel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12298) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Molder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12299) granting an increase of pension to Jerry Daniel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 12300) granting a pension to Katherin Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 12301) for the relief of the owners of the schooner *Henry O. Barrett*; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 12302) granting a pension to Chloe A. Truax; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12303) granting a pension to Naomi Towner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROSE: A bill (H. R. 12304) granting a pension to Annie C. Bonebreak; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 12305) granting a pension to Maria Theresa Smyth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALDOW: A bill (H. R. 12306) granting a pension to Margaret A. Kinney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON: Petition of D. C. J. Winder and 54 other residents of Kankakee County, Ill., demanding the repeal of the second-class postage provisions of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce, Kenosha, Wis., asking Government aid in the construction and maintenance of highways, etc.; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. DALE of Vermont: Petition of the Rebekah Council of Vermont, favoring war prohibition; also the petition of a county convention of interdenominational Sunday schools of Vermont, favoring the Barkley war prohibition bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of Mrs. M. E. Harden and other residents of Alameda County, Cal., favoring the repeal of the zone-rate system of second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Joseph H. Matthews, Edward W. Woodward, and J. R. Scupham, indorsing House bill 259, introduced by Mr. RAKER; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Frank Sextus and other residents of Alameda County, Cal., favoring the minimum wage bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petitions of Denison Coffee Co.; The Lord & Bushnell Co.; Hall, Wedge & Carter; the Pacific Mutual Door Co.; the Central Bureau, Furniture & Casket Manufacturers, all of Chicago; and Walter D. Williams, manager Security Insurance Co., of Rockford, Ill., protesting against any repeal or postponement of the advanced second-class postage rates as provided in the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Resolution of the Board of Commissioners of Skamania County, Wash., favoring the construction of military highways and post roads in the States of Washington, Oregon, and California; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Tacoma Central Labor Union, the Tacoma Metal Trades Council, the Tacoma Building Trades Council, and the Tacoma Mill and Smelter Men's Union, No. 27, favoring the Smith-Sears rehabilitation bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. KAHN: Papers to accompany H. R. 12291, a bill granting a pension to George Casseboom, Company A, First California Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: Communication from J. Andrew Wilt, adjutant, Watkins Post, No. 68, Grand Army of the Republic, Towanda, Pa., favoring the passage of the so-called Smoot pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Marcellus, N. Y., favoring prohibition as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### SENATE.

TUESDAY, May 28, 1918.

Rev. J. L. Kibler, of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

O God, our Heavenly Father, at this critical hour of the world war, with vast interests hanging in the balance and the world looking on with restless anxiety, we appeal to Thy power to defend our men at the front who are struggling to maintain the principles which pertain to Thy kingdom. The cause of justice and righteousness and honor is the habitation of Thy throne, and we look to Thee with great confidence to lead on the forces contending for these principles. As Thou didst bid Thine ancient people to go forward, and gavest them a lasting victory over their foes, so do Thou speak to our armies on the field of battle to-day and give them a triumphant victory. Paralyze the arms that are raised against them until their enemies shall see the hand of God in the defense of the right, and seek no longer to destroy the peace of mankind. We ask it for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3799) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 12211. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War and to widows of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 12229. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; and

H. R. 12280. An act making appropriations to supply additional urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 8764) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of the State of Illinois into the Union, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.